

8
13
DEPARTMENT OF STATE



Bulletin

Vol. XLIII, No. 1113

October 24, 1960

KEY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COMMUNIST
THREAT • *by Charles E. Bohlen* 635

DOES HIGHER EDUCATION HAVE OBLIGATIONS
IN RELATION TO POLITICAL OBJECTIVES
ABROAD? • *by Robert H. Thayer* 646

THE 1960 UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON
TIN • *Article by C. W. Nichols* 661

For index see inside back cover

AL
RECORD

STATES
N POLICY

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bulletin

VOL. XLIII, No. 1113 • PUBLICATION 7091

October 24, 1960

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Office of Public Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
\$2 issues, domestic \$3.50, foreign \$12.25
Single copy, 25 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 20, 1958).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

Key Characteristics of the Communist Threat

by Charles E. Bohlen

Special Assistant to the Secretary of State¹

It is an honor for me to be here with you this evening to participate with so distinguished a group of citizens in a discussion of what few would question as the central problem of our times. If we fail to understand the true nature of communism and its implications to our national security, we shall have increasing difficulties in dealing with this central problem in the coming decade and as citizens in supporting the decisions which must be taken by our Government to meet it.

"Project Alert" is a good designation for the kind of job of education that has to be done not only in your community but throughout this nation. I have been particularly impressed by the sobriety and seriousness with which this problem is presented in the statement of policy setting forth the aims and purposes of Project Alert. I have been especially heartened by the emphasis placed upon education and understanding and not an attack upon persons or groups, nor does it seek to present, in your own words, "an opportunity to get rid of emotional and uninformed and biased opinion." This is most certainly the proper way to approach the problem of understanding the true nature of the danger we face generally encompassed in the term "Communist" and a healthy warning of the undoubted fact that without sobriety and understanding of its true nature the struggle against communism can be easily perverted to the real detriment of our society.

I have spent virtually all of my adult life in dealing in one form or another with this problem. I am all too aware that people can be blind to the

dangers of communism, but I am also conscious of the fact that they can be blinded by it.

Communism is a very large and complicated subject. Literally thousands of books have been written about its various aspects—historical, ideological, political, economic, sociological. It is obviously not possible in the confines of a short talk to cover all the aspects of the Communist problem or indeed to go thoroughly into any one of them. I shall try, however, tonight to select those which seem to me to be the controlling factors of the Communist problem as it affects our country and our society and indeed, I might add, all of the nations of the free world. I do not propose tonight to dwell particularly upon the domestic aspects of the Communist danger in the United States.

I would only say that under present conditions the domestic threat of communism is not primarily political. By this I mean the possibility of a sufficient number of our citizens accepting the Communist doctrine and the discipline of the Communist Party so as to become a political threat to our democratic system. The domestic danger of communism here lies not in the field of open political activity but rather in the field of espionage and the possibility of infiltration and penetration of concealed Communist agents in the Government, labor unions, student associations, and other private bodies. Defending ourselves against this aspect of the danger, however, is one for the agencies of the United States Government both Federal and local which are particularly qualified to deal with this problem. The chief of these, of course, is the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which has long experience in this matter and needs no special project to make them alert to its dangers.

¹Address made at El Paso, Tex., on Oct. 7 at the opening program of Project Alert, a community education program sponsored by the El Paso City Council Advisory Committee (press release 587).

It is a technical job, and, while the danger is always there, I believe we are well armed against it.

It is, however, on the domestic scene that we must bear in mind the words of your statement of policy which I cited earlier. The dangers and temptations to use the domestic aspect of the Communist menace for other purposes, such as to incriminate or slander individuals or groups of different views, must be guarded against. The real danger of communism must never be used as a smokescreen for the persecution of those with whose views on social, economic, and political matters we may not agree. We should learn from the history of the Fascist dictatorships the dangers to a democracy of the loose or calculated use of the charge of communism. It is of vital importance that we should not permit this struggle to be transformed into an impairment of the freedoms guaranteed by our Constitution. To make the proper distinction which would permit us on the one hand to deal with the danger as it is, without abuse and damage to the very things we seek to defend, requires mature judgment and a clear recognition of the nature of the problem on the part of our citizens.

Not only because I have dealt during my life with our foreign affairs but also because the real menace of communism to the United States comes from without, I shall deal primarily tonight with the nature of this external danger and its effect upon our foreign relations and security.

Historical Development of Communism

It is necessary before discussing the present world scene and our relations to it, however, to deal briefly with the theory and practice of communism, including a word on its historical origins and development. Volumes have been written on this subject, but I believe a few observations on this point are necessary in order to understand why communism enshrined in power in a number of countries in the world constitutes the greatest menace that this country has ever experienced since its founding. I shall only talk on those aspects of the origin and development of this doctrine which are of particular relevance today.

Marxism is a theory that developed in the middle of the 19th century, in large measure as a result of the impact of industrialization on the semifeudal societies of Europe at that time. It

was a theory whereby the history of human society was explained solely in terms of the class struggle; that is, an irreconcilable conflict between those classes of society which own the instruments of production, described by Marx as bourgeois, and those who had no property and only their labor power to sell, described as the proletariat. It asserted that Marx and his associate, Engels, had discovered what they termed the scientific laws for the development of human society: that following the period of capitalism the proletariat, who, according to this theory, would become the overwhelming majority in any industrial society, would seize power, establish socialism, and proceed to construct a classless society under the "dictatorship" of the proletariat.

While in general during the latter part of the 19th century and the early part of the 20th these doctrines in theory were accepted by the majority of European socialists, the influence of the humanistic traditions of European civilization, as well as the development of capitalism itself, led to a considerable modification in practice of this theory. By the time of World War I the Marxian doctrine of the inevitability of violent revolution as well as certain other aspects of the theory had been modified so that by 1914 "social democracy," as it came to be known, operated much more on the basis of evolution through the process of democracy than on the belief of violent revolution.

Had it not been for the accident—and I mean the accident—of the seizure of power in Russia in November 1917 by a small band of revolutionary known as Bolsheviks headed by Lenin, it is very likely that in Europe, at least, communism would have continued to develop along the lines of social democracy and as such would have presented no real problem and certainly no threat to the United States. An example of this is the British Labor government in England or the Social Democratic governments in the Scandinavian countries. However, Lenin and his associates, as dedicated Marxists, took as the basis of their action and beliefs this doctrine in its original, harshest, and more extreme form, disregarding, and indeed denouncing, the evolutionary trend which Western civilization had brought to it in the intervening period. The result of the impact of this Marxian doctrine on the war weary in the semifeudal empire of the czars in the hands of professional Russian revolutionary produced what in official jargon

is called "Marxism-Leninism," or more properly "Bolshevism." Bolshevism, in my opinion therefore, is a much more accurate description of the doctrinal aspect of the problem we face than is the term "communism."

It is one of the ironies of history that power in Russia was seized not by a revolution in the true sense of the word but by a coup d'etat and by a group of fanatical followers of Marx in a country where the circumstances at that time contained none of the prerequisites which Marx had laid down for the establishment of a socialist society. It was a seizure of power by a minority representing considerably less than 1 percent of the people in Russia and far inferior in numbers to other political parties existing in 1917. No objective historian asserts that the Bolshevik regime in Russia was established in conformity with the will of its people. On the contrary, the Constituent Assembly elected previous to the Bolshevik seizure of power in the only free and universal election which Russia had known before or has known since was dissolved by Bolshevik bayonets precisely because these elected representatives of the people were overwhelmingly non-Bolshevik.

It is, of course, not its historical origin or the factors which led to the seizure of power in Russia in 1917 that make the Communist problem of particular interest to the United States in the 1960's. They are only relevant and important to the degree to which they have continued to exercise a controlling influence on its nature and development.

Role of Ideology

The fact that in Russia this doctrine was enshrined by a tiny minority is still a very important conditioning factor in its present form. In reality, although any Communist would deny it with utmost heat and passion, the theory of communism is no longer the central and vital factor in the movement. It is, of course, essential to have some understanding of the ideology and the particular role it plays in Soviet policy and in the attempt to extend Communist power to other countries, but I give it lower priority than other factors precisely because its powers of persuasion have greatly diminished in the postwar world.

Ideology is important in that it represents a body of thought conditioning the mentality of the Soviet leaders, affecting their choice of alternatives and reaction in a given situation. It also

continues to be the honey that catches the flies abroad, although to a much less degree than, say, during the decade of the 1930's—during the period of the worldwide depression. It has another function under which its followers are relieved from chief one, deriving from the assertion that Marxism represents a scientific analysis of the inevitable development of human society coupled with a denial of the existence of any objective standard of morality or ethics.

Ideology thus constitutes a permanent dispensation under which its followers are relieved from the observance of any standard whatsoever of morality, ethics, or fair play. This I assure you is very important. It permits, and indeed justifies, Communists to lie, deceive, and operate with a disregard of human suffering without undue violence to their consciences as human beings. They believe they are operating in accordance with the iron laws of history and that all, and quite literally all, is permitted for the achievement of Communist aims. Ideology, despite the extremely important role it plays, is not in my opinion among the controlling factors in its operation today. If it were and if Communists were prepared to submit their doctrine to the interplay in the free marketplace of ideas and sought merely to convince people of the correctness of their theory, they would not be in power anywhere in the world today. There is no instance when a Communist system has been consciously voted into power by any people in any country in the world. Therefore, without underrating the influence it does play, I believe other factors are more controlling.

These factors are power, discipline, and deception.

Power, Discipline, and Deception

It is the power of the Soviet Union and the growing power of Communist China that constitute the core of the menace we face. Under the centralized ruthless dictatorship of the successors of the tiny minority that seized power in Russia in 1917, the Soviet Union, always a country of great potentiality, has made remarkable advances in developing the sinews of state power. The fact that this is done at the expense of the Russian people with a total disregard for the rights of the individual, democracy, and freedom, should not blind us to the simple fact of the continued growth of Soviet power, both military and industrial.

Although by all economic indices the Soviet Union is considerably behind the United States in all sectors of its economy, nonetheless the Soviet rulers have been and are able to divert more of their gross national product to the sinews of national power than we have. Therefore, in terms of power, a purely statistical comparison can be misleading. The same can be said, although at an earlier stage in its development, of Communist China.

To the reality of great and increasing national power—and I am speaking now only of the Soviet Union—should be added the fact that the same group of men that rules the Soviet Union also commands the obedience and services of a worldwide network of agencies—the Communist parties—which quite literally operate in every country in the world. In the countries of Eastern Europe, where the Communist parties have been installed by the Soviet armies, they control the governments. Despite the acquisition of government power these parties, with one exception—Yugoslavia, where the conquest of power was not due to Soviet arms—are still subservient to the dictates of Moscow. This network of parties does not constitute an international movement in the true sense of the word if by this we mean a free association of independent political parties bound together by a common doctrine. This is what the Soviets have consistently sought to depict these parties as being. In reality they are in the truest sense of the word obedient and subservient instruments of Soviet policy.

In short, the Soviet Government in addition to its own national power enjoys the great advantage of maintaining fifth columns in every country in the world. It is here that the second controlling element of the Communist organization and discipline is most clearly manifest. Since the original formulation of the Communist International, or "Comintern," as it was known, in 1919, the Communist parties of the world have become progressively subordinate in every respect to the will of the rulers of the Soviet Union. The Soviets, particularly under Stalin, did not seek to recruit members for Communist parties for reasons of ideological belief—indeed there are many evidences that the idealist is deeply distrusted—but rather disciplined soldiers who would carry out unquestionably the orders received from above.

It is because of this tight, disciplined organization of the Communist parties that the Soviet Union has been able to command the consistent chorus of support in words and deeds for any one of the zigzags of Soviet policy no matter how contradictory. It is also the reason why the Soviets have been able to utilize for espionage purposes citizens of other countries. While technically the Comintern, or its postwar successor in Europe, the Cominform, no longer exists, the basic form of organization and subservience to Moscow has remained unchanged. It is in recognition of this fact that the law of the United States makes membership in the Communist Party a criminal offense while imposing no legal sanctions whatsoever in conformity with our Bill of Rights against individuals or groups who may be interested or even attracted by Marxian ideology as such.

The third factor to which I think importance should be attached is that of deceit. In effect the use of deception stems logically from what I have said before. Since Communist ideology in most countries has limited popular appeal, it is not used to extend Soviet power and influence. The true aims of the Communist Party have been masked under the guise of other causes and purposes. The wide development of what is termed "front organizations" is a clear evidence of this fact. This does not mean—and I do not wish to be misunderstood on this point—that any group or individual supporting such popular causes is Communist influenced or should be placed in the category of Communist sympathizers. I merely state that Communist parties find it necessary now because of the lack of appeal of the open propagation of their ideas very often to conceal their activities under many guises. In its international relations, likewise, the Soviet Union has not in recent years as a government openly supported the local Communist parties. Rather it will seek to enhance its influence and control by other methods. For example, in the newly independent countries the Soviet Union poses as the champion of anti-colonialism.

The ultimate aim everywhere remains the installation of the Communist power, but Soviet policy being highly flexible in many areas of the world may well consider its interests best served by genuine support at the present world juncture of non-Communist movements or countries.

Their chief purpose at the present time is to disrupt wherever possible the cohesion of the free world, and they support the concept of neutrality as a means of weakening or disrupting the collective security measures of the free world.

I might add on the subject of neutrality that, while it is, of course, up to each nation to decide the course of its foreign policy, neutrality in the sense of nonparticipation in military alliance is a perfectly responsible posture and one which we from our history should recognize as such. Neutrality in a sense of pretending to be indifferent to the gigantic struggle which is going on in the world today is quite another matter. I might, however, add that while the Soviets and their Communist adherents support neutrality wherever it can weaken the free world they do not accept it ever in connection with the Communist bloc. The tragic events in Hungary in the fall of 1956 are bloody and eloquent witnesses to the truth of this statement.

Communist Aims

A few words on the subject of Communist aims. There is no subject that is more difficult to assess in its true value than this one. The doctrine by its very terms is worldwide in its application, and in this sense the entire world is its objective. On the other hand, the history of the Soviet Union has demonstrated that it regards with hostility and suspicion any system whether Communist or not that it does not guide and control. I would seriously doubt that the men in the Kremlin believe as a practical matter that they could exercise control over a Communist world. Here you have an interesting but not necessarily important contradiction between the universal applicability of the theory and the Kremlin's insistence upon domination of the movement.

For our purposes, however, I would submit that it is irrelevant whether the Soviet ambition is to dominate the whole world or merely to dominate a sufficient part of it to exercise a dictatorial and controlling interest in world affairs. If war comes, an event which we must all devoutly hope will not occur, it will in my opinion not be because of the global aspirations of the Communist leaders but over some aggression by Communist armed forces against the free world at any point on the globe where the frontiers of freedom and Communist dictatorship meet.

I have thus briefly touched on the ingredients which seem to me to constitute the nature of the menace we face. I am sure from this you will agree that at the present time the danger is primarily one from abroad, one primarily based upon Soviet and Chinese Communist national strength uninhibited by any considerations of morality or ethics in their single-minded pursuit of power, and reinforced by a disciplined network of fifth columns. While, as I have indicated, ideology is a vital part of this process, we should not be deluded into the belief that the possible intellectual appeal of Communist doctrine is the major danger we face. If this danger must be summed up in one word, I would say it is power.

This naturally presents us with what we, the United States and its citizens, must do in the face of what is unquestionably the greatest challenge to our country, our society, and our civilization that we have ever faced since the founding of this Republic. Time will not permit me to go into every aspect of what is necessary to meet this challenge. I am sure, given the ruthlessness of our enemy, no one would disagree with the statement that the United States and its associates in the free world cannot tolerate a Soviet superiority in military power. I do not wish to infer that the problem of military aggression is the only one we face. Far from it. But certainly without a continued margin of military superiority all other efforts will be unavailing and our survival as a nation and those of our partners in the free world would exist at the sufferance of dictators who have never shown the slightest restraint except fear of the consequences in the exercise of military power.

Secondly, our society must be strong and vigorous and must continue to demonstrate to the world that national purpose, economic growth, and social progress flourish but in freedom, and outmatch in any area of human society the Communist dictatorships.

Lastly, and this is particularly fresh in my mind coming as I do directly from the present session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the battleground between the two conflicting concepts of human society may well be in what is generally called underdeveloped countries of the world. This is a general term which is frequently abused, but in essence it means those countries that for one historical reason or another have not made the economic and technical advances which the

older industrialized countries have made. They also comprise, in particular, countries whose independence has been recently achieved and which indeed in some cases can be measured in months. This problem, vast in its dimensions, will pose for the Government and the people of the United States a challenge in the true sense of that over-worked word. It will require economic and technical assistance from us for which we propose, as you will have seen from the President's speech of September 22 before the General Assembly,² to utilize to much greater extent than in the past the facilities of the United Nations. In addition to material and technical assistance this task will require from us a very great exercise of imagination and understanding.

We will have to recognize that no system of society, however successful it has been at home, can be automatically transferred abroad. Nor should we expect that the consciousness of our own virtues, however brightly they might shine against the Soviet record in world affairs, will be automatically accepted as such by foreign countries.

I would venture to predict—which is of course a foolish thing to do—that the outcome of the great struggle now in which we are engaged will in large measure be decided on the success or failure of the policies of the free world in regard to the underdeveloped nations. This struggle, erroneously stated by the Communists to be one between communism vs. capitalism, is really the age-old struggle in a most dangerous form between freedom and tyranny.

U.S. Protests Provocative Flight by Cuban Aircraft

Press release 559 dated October 8

The U.S. Government on October 7 protested the unwarranted and provocative flight of a Cuban Air Force plane which had on that day made repeated low passes in an aggressive manner over a U.S. submarine off the Florida Keys. The incident occurred between 11:47 a.m. and 12:24 p.m. in an area regularly used for training exercises and located 28 miles southwest of Key West, Fla., in clearly defined international waters.

At the time indicated, the U.S.S. *Balao* to-

gether with an unarmed United States S-2F aircraft were jointly engaged in peaceful maneuvers when a Cuban "Sea Fury" fighter aircraft bearing the number 510 suddenly dove on them and made repeated low-level passes.

The protest, in the form of a note¹ addressed to the Cuban Chargé d'Affaires, was delivered to the Cuban Embassy in Washington at 7:30 p.m. In addition to the protest the Government of Cuba was requested to take such steps as may be required to prevent a repetition of such incidents.

U.S. Position on Dominican Sugar Purchases Explained to Venezuela

On September 26 Dr. Carlos Pérez de la Cova, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of Venezuela, presented to the Department of State an aide memoire expressing his Government's concern over recent authorization for U.S. purchases of sugar in the Dominican Republic. The Department transmitted its reply to the Venezuelan Embassy by an aide memoire dated September 30. Following are texts of the U.S. and Venezuelan aide memoire.

U.S. AIDE MEMOIRE

Press release 583 dated October 5

The Department of State refers to the Embassy's Aide Memoire of September 26, 1960, expressing the concern of the Government of Venezuela on learning "of the recent decision taken by the Government of the United States to acquire three hundred and twenty-one thousand extra tons of sugar from the Dominican Republic".

It is believed that the concern of the Venezuelan Government derives from a misunderstanding of the nature of the action taken. When the Congress of the United States, in July 1960, modified the existing sugar legislation to authorize the President to reduce imports from Cuba² it specifically provided that any resulting deficit in imports should be made up by authorization to purchase sugar from other producing countries including the Dominican Republic, in accordance with a detailed formula made obligatory by the

¹ Not printed.

² BULLETIN of July 25, 1960, p. 140.

law. The President allocated the required increase in quota to the Dominican Republic but delayed authorizing such purchases. In the light of the events which led up to the Sixth Meeting of Foreign Ministers at San José in August of this year and the results of that meeting³ the President asked the Congress to change the law and grant discretionary authority with respect to authorization for such purchases from the Dominican Republic.⁴ The Congress, however, adjourned without action on this request.

The debate in the Congress regarding the proposed revision of the legislation received widespread publicity and it was believed therefore that knowledge of the existing legislation was adequate throughout the American republics, when, following the failure of Congress to provide relief, the President was unable to delay further the implementation of the law as regards authorization for such purchases.

On taking this action, the President observed the spirit of the Sixth Meeting of Foreign Ministers within his existing authority, by imposing a fee of two cents per pound on purchases of sugar from the Dominican Republic, which purchases the law required to be authorized. This has the effect of establishing a price for such imports approximating the world market price rather than the higher United States price which would otherwise have prevailed. The Dominican Republic thus has been deprived of special benefits enjoyed by all other countries which currently sell sugar in the United States market. As compared to sales in available world markets, shipments to the United States should not be construed as providing to the Dominican Republic either greater total exports or higher prices. On the other hand, the United States price benefits of which the Dominican Republic is thus deprived, would amount to an estimated thirteen million dollars for this calendar year, provided of course that the imports presently authorized actually take place.

The Government of the United States is of the opinion that its action with regard to price is not only consistent with the letter and the spirit of the decisions taken at the Sixth Meeting of Foreign Ministers, but that, in addition, its action goes

beyond that of any other American state, with the possible exception of Venezuela, in the magnitude of economic measures which are being applied.

The Embassy and the Government of Venezuela may rest assured that the Government of the United States will continue its efforts, within the framework of its constitutional and legal possibilities, to pursue the objectives manifested in the discussions and understanding of the Sixth Meeting of Foreign Ministers at San José.

VENEZUELAN AIDE MEMOIRE

Translation

The Government of Venezuela has learned with surprise and great concern of the recent decision taken by the Government of the United States for acquiring 321,000 tons extra of sugar from the Dominican Republic.

The Embassy of Venezuela, in compliance with instructions from its Government, wishes to make known to the Department of State the unfavorable repercussions that this decision has caused in the political circles of the country, that is complicating its present political situation and that undoubtedly will extend to all the continent, in the moment in which there is required greater understanding and solidarity to defend the unity of the Americas.

The Government of Venezuela considers that this decision of the Government of the United States impairs that which was agreed in the Sixth Meeting of the American Foreign Ministers which recently took place in San José, Costa Rica, and disorients the continental public opinion with respect to the collective efforts that should be carried out in order to maintain the prestige and the solidarity of the inter-American system.

Upon expressing these sentiments of its Government, the Embassy of Venezuela would appreciate receiving the assurances of the Government of the United States to the effect that it will continue, within its constitutional and legal powers, its efforts toward modifying the present situation, thus also to achieve the collective application of effective economic sanctions for the objective of complying with that which was decided in the Foreign Ministers' meeting above referred to.

WASHINGTON, D.C., 26 September 1960

Inter-American Advisory Committee Holds Sixth Meeting

Press release 580 dated October 5

The Department of State announced on October 5 that the National Advisory Committee on Inter-American Affairs is meeting in the Department October 5-6. The Acting Secretary [Douglas

³ For background, see *ibid.*, Aug. 8, 1960, p. 224, and Sept. 5, 1960, p. 355.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Sept. 12, 1960, p. 412.

Dillon] will participate in the meeting of the Committee.

This will be the sixth meeting of the Committee since its creation by President Eisenhower on November 14, 1959.¹ The purpose of the Committee is to consider, on a continuing basis, current and long-range problems of our relations with Latin America and to make recommendations thereon to the Secretary of State.

Crown Prince and Princess of Japan Visit Washington

Crown Prince Akihito and Crown Princess Michiko of Japan made an official visit to Washington September 27-30. Following are texts of an exchange of greetings between the Crown Prince and Under Secretary Merchant at the Washington National Airport on September 27 and an exchange of toasts between the Crown Prince and President Eisenhower at a state dinner at the White House on the same day, together with a list of the members of the official party.

EXCHANGE OF GREETINGS

Under Secretary Merchant

Press release 562 dated September 27

On behalf of President Eisenhower I am delighted to welcome Your Imperial Highnesses, Crown Prince Akihito and Crown Princess Michiko, to Washington. We in the United States have been looking forward with great pleasure to this visit, and we know that as representatives of the great nation and the friendly people of Japan you will find an unusually warm welcome wherever you go.

In this centennial year of relations between the United States and Japan, there have been held in both nations many celebrations commemorating the first Japanese diplomatic mission to visit Washington.² The pleasure of receiving Your Imperial Highnesses in Washington is for us a

fitting climax to these celebrations, and a further opportunity to express our deep friendship for the people of Japan.

It is our sincere wish that you will enjoy your stay among us, and we know that you will find in the friendly reception you will receive a happy indication of the close and friendly ties between our two peoples.

Crown Prince Akihito

The Princess and I are most grateful for your very cordial welcome. It is a great honor and a great pleasure for us to visit Washington as guests of the President of the United States.

We bring with us the warm greetings of the people of Japan. We are happy to join with the people of the United States in celebrating the centennial of the formal opening of diplomatic relations between our two countries.

We look forward with you to a brilliant new century of Japanese-American friendship and co-operation for world peace and prosperity.

EXCHANGE OF TOASTS

White House press release dated September 27

The President

Your Imperial Highnesses, ladies and gentlemen: In the past 8 years that it has been the good fortune of my wife and myself to entertain representatives of nations great and small at this table, one thing is certain: we have never entertained a couple who showed such youth, vitality, and charm as the couple that we are so fortunate as to have this evening.

Possibly they won the hearts of America as they have come across our continent partially because of their youth, because our country is a young country. But we must remember also that Japan, although a very old nation, is also young. Starting just a century ago, there began in that country a great renaissance. We are proud that we had a small part in bringing about its beginning.

Today it is flowering into a great production and prosperity that will certainly continue on into the future, and Japan stands again as one of the proud countries that values its independence and with us believes in the democratic ideal of life.

¹ For background, see BULLETIN of July 25, 1960, p. 148.

² For an article by E. Taylor Parks on "The First Japanese Diplomatic Mission to the United States—1860," see BULLETIN of May 9, 1960, p. 744.

So I think all of us will deem it a great privilege, as we honor the Crown Prince and the Crown Princess at this table, to drink a toast also to this country and its Emperor, His Imperial Majesty the Emperor of Japan.

Crown Prince Akihito

Mr. President, Mrs. Eisenhower, and distinguished guests: I am deeply moved, Mr. President, by the cordial words addressed directly to me and to the Princess, and through us I believe to the people of my country.

May I say, Mr. President, that you are held by all free peoples the world over in the highest respect and affection because of your candor and sincerity, your warmth of heart, and above all your love of peace.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have the honor to propose a toast to the great friend and preeminent leader of the free world, the President of the United States and his gracious lady.

OFFICIAL PARTY

The Department of State announced on September 15 (press release 543) that the following would accompany Crown Prince Akihito and Crown Princess Michiko as members of the official party:

Koichiro Asakai, Ambassador of Japan to the United States
Madame Koichiro Asakai, wife of the Ambassador of Japan
Shinzo Koizumi, Special Adviser to the Crown Prince's Household
Shigenobu Shima, Deputy Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan
Kikao Suzuki, Grand Master of the Crown Prince's Household
Yasuhiko Yamada, chamberlain to His Imperial Highness the Crown Prince
Tukihisa Tamura, Counselor of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan
Toshiro Shimanouchi, Counselor, Embassy of Japan
Madame Sumiko Makino, chief lady-in-waiting to Her Imperial Highness the Crown Princess
Madame Tatsuo Takaki, lady-in-waiting to Her Imperial Highness the Crown Princess
Yasuhide Toda, chamberlain to His Imperial Highness the Crown Prince
Masaaki Yumoto, physician to Their Imperial Highnesses the Crown Prince and Crown Princess
Madame Yoshiko Imamura, lady-in-waiting to Her Imperial Highness the Crown Princess

Letters of Credence

Union of South Africa

The newly appointed Ambassador of the Union of South Africa, Willem Christiaan Naude, presented his credentials to President Eisenhower on October 6. For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 584 dated October 6.

President and Secretary Congratulate Nigeria on Independence

MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

White House press release dated October 1

The White House on October 1 made public the following message from President Eisenhower to the Government and people of the Federation of Nigeria.

SEPTEMBER 30, 1960

On behalf of the people of the United States of America, I wish to extend to the Government and people of Nigeria heartiest congratulations on the occasion of their independence.

We in the United States have watched with sympathy and admiration the progress of the people of Nigeria toward this historic and welcome event which is the result of fruitful cooperation between the people of Nigeria and the Government and people of the United Kingdom. We are confident that this spirit of cooperation will inspire Nigeria's future relationships with all who hold freedom dear.

In expressing the best wishes of my country, I speak for a people who cherish individual liberty and independence, and who have made great sacrifices so that these vital principles might endure. It is with special pleasure, therefore, that we witness the assumption by this new nation of its sovereign place in the world community.

I am keenly conscious of the friendship which has marked the relations of our two countries. We take great pride in bonds established by Nigerian government leaders whom we were privileged to receive as guests, and by the many Nigerians who have studied in our land.

For the future, we in the United States stand

ready to work with the people of Nigeria to reach the goals we all share of health, enlightenment and material well being. I am confident that in years to come our two countries will stand as one in safeguarding the greatest of all bonds between us, our common belief in a free and democratic way of life.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

MESSAGE FROM SECRETARY HERTER

Press release 572 dated September 30

Following is the text of a message from Secretary Herter to the people of Nigeria on the occasion of their independence, October 1, 1960. The message was recorded by the Secretary for transmission by the Voice of America.

I am very happy indeed to have this opportunity to express my warm good wishes, as well as those of the American people, on the occasion of Nigeria's achievement of independence. We are proud of the Nigerian ancestry of many Americans, of the fact that some of your great leaders received their higher education at American universities, and of the spiritual kinship between our federal constitutions. We are pleased to see the steady growth of many projects of co-operation between Nigeria and the United States in the fields of economics and education, and we look forward to ever closer bonds in these fields.

Here at the United Nations, where I am currently leading the delegation of my country to the General Assembly, we are very much aware that this year is the year of Africa. The United States has welcomed the presence of an unprecedented number of new members, all but one of them African. The admission of Nigeria to this world organization will be a worthy culmination of this African year.¹ We wish the people of Nigeria the blessings of freedom, prosperity, and internal harmony, and we are looking forward to the contribution which the wise counsels of its representatives to the United Nations will certainly make to the cause of world peace.

¹For texts of statements by Secretary Herter and Assistant Secretary Francis O. Wilcox at the time of the admission of the Federation of Nigeria to the United Nations on Oct. 7, see p. 659.

India and U.S. Open Aviation Consultations at New Delhi

Press release 578 dated October 3

The Governments of India and the United States began civil aviation consultations on October 3 at New Delhi. These consultations will provide the first opportunity for a general review of civil aviation matters since the two countries signed the Air Transport Services Agreement of February 3, 1956.¹

The chairman of the U.S. delegation will be Edward A. Bolster, Director of the Office of Transport and Communications of the Department of State. The chairman of the Indian delegation will be K. M. Raha, Director General, Civil Aviation.

Century 21 Exposition

White House press release dated September 24

WHITE HOUSE ANNOUNCEMENT

The President has signed an Executive order designating the Department of Commerce as the agency to head up Federal participation in the Century 21 Exposition scheduled to be held at Seattle, Wash., in 1962. This action formalizes 2 years of activity since passage of Public Law 85-880, the basic act for Federal participation in the exposition.

This public law authorized the President to designate an agency to first conduct a study to determine the extent to which the U.S. Government should participate in Century 21 and requested cooperation with State and local exposition officials. The legislation also called for the appointment by the President of a U.S. Commissioner for the Federal exhibit.

In November 1958 President Eisenhower addressed the Secretary of Commerce and requested that this study be made under his direction. U.S. participation in the exposition was declared to be both important and timely, and in July 1959 the President directed the Secretary of State to transmit invitations to foreign governments to also take

¹Treaties and Other International Acts Series 3504

part.¹
appropri
exhibit.
Philip
Assistant
pointed
Cong
exhibit
civiliza
in natu
play of
ing out
that in
Govern
and the
private
for the
of Com

EXECU

DESIGNA
FUNCTI
UNITED

By vi
Septemb
called th
(73 Stat
is order
Secre
designat
provided
act eth
in terms

Sec. 2
the Fed
State an
to coope
Depart
of the a
Sec. 3
shall be
Public
tion ref
Sec. 4
to the
(23 F.R
of July
Exposit

THE W
Septem

¹BUL
378.
²25 D

Octob

part.¹ In September of that year the Congress appropriated \$9 million for a U.S. Government exhibit.

Philip M. Evans, formerly of Seattle and an Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, was appointed U.S. Commissioner.

Congress also directed that the objective of the exhibit be to depict the role of science in modern civilization. As a result the building, permanent in nature, will house the most comprehensive display of science subjects ever assembled. In carrying out this mission the Executive order directs that interested departments and agencies of the Government, including the Department of State and the National Science Foundation, give appropriate cooperation to the Federal Commissioner for the U.S. science exhibit and to the Department of Commerce.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10887²

DESIGNATING THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO PERFORM FUNCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE CENTURY 21 EXPOSITION

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the act of September 2, 1958, 72 Stat. 1703, as amended, hereinafter called the act, and by the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), and as President of the United States, it is ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. The Department of Commerce is hereby designated as the department to perform all functions provided for in the act except those functions which the act either authorizes other agencies to perform or vests, in terms, in the President.

SEC. 2. Other interested departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including the Department of State and the National Science Foundation, are requested to cooperate as provided by section 4 of the act with the Department of Commerce in carrying out the provisions of the act.

SEC. 3. Any building constructed pursuant to the act shall become and shall be a "public building" under the Public Buildings Act of 1959 upon the close of the Exposition referred to in the act.

SEC. 4. This order supersedes the letter of the President to the Secretary of Commerce dated November 13, 1958 (23 F.R. 9169), but shall not affect Proclamation No. 3302 of July 10, 1959, entitled "World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition (Century 21 Exposition)."

THE WHITE HOUSE,
September 23, 1960.

Dwight D. Eisenhower

Development Assistance Group Concludes Third Meeting

Press release 588 dated October 8

Following is the text of a communique issued at Washington, D.C., on October 5 by the Development Assistance Group at the close of its third meeting.¹

The third meeting of the Development Assistance Group took place in Washington, D.C. from October 3-5. The United States acted as host government and the Honorable T. Graydon Upton, Assistant Secretary, U.S. Treasury Department, was Chairman of the meeting.

The membership of the Development Assistance Group is as follows: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Portugal, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the Commission of the European Economic Community, all of whom participated in the meeting. The Group extended a cordial welcome to Mr. Thorkil Kristensen, the Secretary-General of the OEEC [Organization for European Economic Cooperation] and Secretary-General designate of the OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development], who attended the proceedings of the Group for the first time. Mr. Kristensen welcomed the fact that the Group was to function within the framework of the OECD, as agreed upon last July by the Ministerial Conference.

In accordance with the procedures adopted for previous DAG meetings, Delegations from each country made statements informing the Group of developments in their aid policies, programs, and institutions since the last meeting. Several representatives noted an increase in their countries' financial commitments to the less-developed areas, and some countries referred to changes in the administration of their aid programs designed to make them more effective. Several countries stated their intention of increasing their contributions to the UN Special Fund and Expanded Technical Assistance Program, and the meeting generally expressed the hope that the total annual resources of these two programs would reach, as soon as possible, the target figure of \$100 million.

The greater part of the meeting was devoted to

¹ For text of a communique issued after the first meeting, see BULLETIN of Apr. 11, 1960, p. 577.

a discussion of pre-investment technical assistance. Representatives from the following international organizations took part in the discussion on this subject: The United Nations, including its Special Fund, the Expanded Technical Assistance Program and representatives of UN regional economic commissions; the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; the Organization of American States; the Inter-American Development Bank; the European Productivity Agency; and the Commission on Technical Assistance in Africa South of the Sahara. Following introductory statements by the representatives of these international organizations, there was a discussion of the methods of extending technical assistance for economic development policies and planning; the importance of resources and engineering surveys and feasibility studies; the linking of pre-investment technical assistance to the operations of capital lending institutions; the role and function of national and international agencies in pre-investment programs; and the means of exchange-

ing information and consultations regarding pre-investment technical assistance activities. A dominant theme of the discussion was the importance of making more effective use of human, as well as the material, resources of the less developed areas and, to this end, the need for manpower surveys and the development of training facilities.

As a result of the studies carried out since the previous meeting, the Group reached agreement as to the basis on which comparable data could be provided by DAG members about the flow of funds from their countries to the less developed areas. Agreement was reached that DAG members would in the future exchange information on this basis. The Group also stressed the importance of obtaining widespread public understanding and support in their respective countries for effective programs of aid to the less developed areas.

At the invitation of the Government of the United Kingdom, it was agreed that the next meeting of the DAG should be held in London in the spring of 1961.

Does Higher Education Have Obligations in Relation to Political Objectives Abroad?

by Robert H. Thayer¹

It is a great pleasure to be here today and to have the privilege of discussing with you the important and complex topic which has been assigned to me. We start, I think, with several very definite assumptions born of recent rapid events. The United States Government in its foreign relations has passed through two distinct phases. Directly after World War II it plunged into economic aid programs in order to

put our allies back on their feet. We then moved to the second phase through the offer of technical assistance to the less developed areas of the world. Point 4, it was called. Today we are entering, in fact we are in the midst of, a third and new phase which I shall call the phase of education, where the U.S. Government is being called upon to find places for students in colleges and universities, both undergraduate and postgraduate, to find professors, teachers, and specialists in all disciplines, to construct whole universities in different areas of the world, and to expand existing universities with entire new departments and new disciplines. The United States Government today is in the business of education. It is not equipped for

¹ Address made before the American Council on Education at Chicago, Ill., on Oct. 6 (press release 582 dated Oct. 4). Mr. Thayer is Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for the Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Relations.

education. It must be assumed that it is to the universities that the Government will turn for assistance in the implementation of this policy. It must be assumed also that the conditions which brought the Government into this third phase will have also a *direct* impact upon the universities.

The topic of this discussion as first given to me in a letter from Dr. Adams [Arthur S. Adams, president of the American Council on Education] was in the form of a question reading as follows: "Does Higher Education Have Obligations in Relation to Political Objectives Abroad?" Now it seems to me that this question has wider implications than the general topic for discussion by this panel as given in the agenda. You will recall that in the agenda our general topic is "Impact on Colleges and Universities of World Responsibilities." There is a subtle difference between these two, although they are obviously closely related, and that difference, it seems to me, is that the question originally given to me is not only broader in its significance but more positive than the agenda topic.

Maintaining the Integrity of the University

I find here also some degree of ambivalence, an ambivalence not only reflected as between Dr. Adams' question and this particular agenda topic but also as between this question and all topics throughout your agenda. To discuss the impact on the universities of world responsibilities to me indicates a worry, a concern, about the action of external forces on the life of the university or, if you will, on its integrity. This implies the need to preserve the ancient concept of the integrity of the university against external forces. To ask whether or not the university has obligations to political objectives abroad implies to me that the writer of the question assumed there were such obligations and that they needed some definition. It implies a search not for a new definition of the function and role of the university but for ways in which higher education can meet the challenges of a world that is coming into being and for ways that institutions of integrity can assist in the creation of that world. The topics and questions of other parts of the agenda reflect the same degree of worry and concern regarding the integrity of the university and the purpose of the university in relation to sponsored research and to State governments as does our own topic here.

I will not read those questions and topics to you.

You have the agenda and I am sure have studied it as closely as I have and so are aware as I am of the manner in which the agenda truthfully reveals the strong currents and undercurrents at work in our universities today. There are the forces, honest and conservative, that fear that the external pressures bearing on the universities from many directions may mean the loss in some degree of the integrity of the university. Then there are the forces, within universities, moving to precipitate them into what seem to be wholly new situations, to involve them in international programs and international responsibilities and to tie them increasingly to research related to modern development financed from outside the universities.

These are difficult and important questions, and in thus discussing the agenda I speak in no critical spirit. Quite the contrary. It seems to me that the agenda written in relation to the complex problems of the university is a reflection of the conditions so characteristic of all American life during the last decade. The university's problem is in one sense peculiar to the university, but it is only part of a wider problem, the problem of defining the purposes, obligations, and responsibilities of the United States in world affairs.

The problem of integrity is surely a university problem, but it is also a problem for the Government in all our foreign relations. This Nation as a nation has traditions and principles and a very definite integrity in the face of the world, and this must be preserved despite the changing world and our position in it. I welcome the lack of certainty of direction revealed in the agenda, for it means that the academic community is now conducting its own debate on the role and function of the university in these most difficult times. And it is within the universities that the debate needs to go forward and not a debate, as some have seemed to think it was, between the Government and the universities. I think I am correct in saying that it is only in recent years that such topics as we are discussing at this conference were generally considered worthy of debate, and I do know that only 4 years ago nearly all the conversations between representatives of the Government and of the universities on international educational problems were little more than discussions between Government and university lawyers and accountants over contractual relations with ICA [International Cooperation Administration]. I suppose

that such discussions still go on, that legal problems and contractual problems still present themselves and will continue to do so, but now we have here a meeting that brings to the real problem, the most important basic problem, the intellectual force and strength of our universities.

The real problems confronting the universities are now being posed. They are well stated in our agenda. They lie within the universities, and it is within the universities that they need to be debated. As a citizen and as a member of a great university, as well as a Government official, I have no doubt that the debate which will and must go on until we enter a new period of history will show the way in which the integrity of the university will not only be preserved but strengthened; and as it is strengthened, the university's concept of itself will be broadened, and it will bring to the work of the Nation an intellectual renaissance which will be a determining factor in shaping the world of tomorrow.

Participation in International Affairs

I would like in passing to be a little philosophical and somewhat more intellectual than is required of a bureaucrat and in so doing to tread on very dangerous ground. I have in these past 2 years attended innumerable meetings with university people, and I think it is fair for me to say that at every meeting there have been some expressions of reluctance on the part of university officials to participate in international affairs. This has been a puzzle to me. I have wondered much about the reasons for this reluctance. I have found it difficult to believe that it was largely a financial problem, although financing international work is difficult. I have found it impossible to believe that our universities regarded themselves as such independent corporate bodies that they could exist independently of the problems of the larger society of which they are and must be a part. I have not been able to accept the thesis that the university has purposes so distinct from that of other institutions that they might be distorted if they were concerned with problems beyond our shores. I find it hard to accept the antagonism toward Washington which frequently creeps into these meetings.

In looking back over the past it is apparent that our colleges and universities have had no difficulty in adapting themselves to the ever-changing

American scene. They have fully taken part in an evolving national purpose. The university in America, as we know it, is after all of very recent development in our society. Our colleges are old and the use of the word university is old, but the complex which we now call a university is really the creation of the 20th century and is a result of the pressures of modern society and the reaction of the university to those pressures. Harvard College in the 17th century graduated men to preach and teach as was required in New England in those days. Today our universities provide instruction and teaching in almost any subject one can name, and our chairman here today, Dr. [J. L.] Morrill, has referred to institutions of higher learning not as universities but as "multi-versities," thus defining the university in terms of our own complex and pluralistic society, in which there is no unity in the sense in which one could use that word in the Middle Ages.

So what is my answer to the problem of the apparent reluctance on the part of universities to participate in international affairs in the face of the vitality of the movement of the Russian Soviets into the world? Does the answer to the problem as related to the universities and to other institutions, and to people generally in the United States—for we are all faced with the problem of defining ourselves and our Nation in this new world—lie perhaps in 20th-century man's view of himself, in the assumptions we make as to the nature of truth, of knowledge, and of learning? I will not attempt to answer my own question, but I want to raise it with you for discussion. It does seem to me that the more scientific and technological we have become, the more we have become fragmented and the less we have been concerned with some of the fundamental aspects of national purpose. The so-called objective pursuit of facts, whether in a scientific laboratory or by a historian, a sociologist, or a political scientist, seems to me to tend to inhibit rather than to promote political action and political purpose. To describe society faithfully and accurately is one thing; to move politically, intuitively, and creatively to organize a society is quite another thing. Are our universities, as our people may be, caught up in a world which is overly concerned with facts in a scientific manner to the extent that the humanistic, the political problem, is of less significance than it once was? The equating, which has increased

over the last century, of man with matter without ideal assumptions as to what man is and ought to be surely tends to fragment society, and if we have no ideal concept of either man or society but only a tendency to explore scientifically man, matter, and society, it is very hard to embark on great programs in the humanistic and liberal political tradition of the Western World.

Why Was the Question Asked?

I have been overly long in getting to my subject, but that has been deliberate. I did not really come here today as an official of the Government to answer your question, and, in a way, I have been discussing what I regard as perhaps a more important question than the one addressed to me, and that question is: Why was the question asked? I have already stated how important I think it is that so many questions indicating that our universities are searching for answers to difficult and important problems have been asked, and if you can answer the question as to why they have had to be raised you will go a long way to answering all the questions in the agenda. The important thing is that they have been raised, that our intellectual community is taking stock of itself and therefore of the Nation, and from this great benefits cannot help but flow. The answers to your questions cannot really come from me, or any Government official, though I would hope that my remarks here today would contribute to your debate.

My work in the Government has been directed, in many ways, to stirring up such a debate as your agenda suggests is needed; or perhaps I should not use the word "debate" but the more current popular word "dialog." The concept of the debate or dialog which I have had in mind was that of communication between groups in our society, including Government, as well as within those groups. From my office went the proposal to Dr. Heald [Henry T. Heald, president of the Ford Foundation] that the study on "The University and World Affairs" be undertaken. This proceeds under the leadership of Dr. Morrill. We in the Department of State have sponsored conferences on "International Education" and on "Cultural Relations of the United States and the Soviet Union" and are now planning in December and January conferences on "Science and the Scientist" and "Business and Industry in International Edu-

cational and Cultural Affairs." Each of these conferences has really been concerned with the problem set here regarding our universities—what is required of the various groups composing our society at this crisis in our affairs and the affairs of the world. Have they obligations in relations to political objectives abroad? What is the impact on them of world responsibilities? From these various groups must come the answers; such is the structure and composition of our society.

Now to answer Dr. Adams' question is a very large order, and I do not hesitate to give you a very simple and direct answer at all. The answer to the question is, of course, yes. Higher education has very definite obligations in relation to political objectives abroad. There is no other possible answer from my point of view as a citizen and a member of a great university, leaving wholly aside my position in the Government. But to explain my affirmative answer immediately involves me in great complexities. It pushes me in the very center of the debate which your agenda calls for, and again I can only say that the final answer to this question lies with you and not with me and can only come over many, many years. To answer it, as I would if I could, would mean that I am prepared to define the role of the university, to explore with you the state of the Nation and the place of the university in the Nation, and to discourse at length on the problems of the world and the relationship of the international to the national and to the university. Dr. Adams has paid me a great compliment in asking me to speak on this question.

Defining the Role of the University

I feel that I must say something about the definition of the role of the university, and, like a good graduate student, I will footnote my text with references to higher authority. I accept wholeheartedly Dr. Morrill's statement that our universities are to be distinguished from universities in other countries by their sense of social responsibility. I believe in a recent book he described the University of Minnesota as an institution that reached to all the boundaries of the State of Minnesota. I also accept the definition of a university as given last spring by Dean Bundy of Harvard. His was the historic definition of the university as an institution existing for the increase and diffusion of knowledge. If, therefore, a university

exists to increase knowledge and to diffuse knowledge, and if also it has a sense of social responsibility, then I submit that the answer to the question must be in the affirmative. I cannot say much more to the question, for is it not up to the university to define what it means by increasing knowledge, diffusing knowledge, and by social responsibility? These things have all once upon a time been defined and redefined, and they will be defined and redefined again, with increasing repetition as our society speeds through lightning change after change.

In the 17th century in New England the problems that preoccupied our colleges were religious to a large extent. "What is knowledge?" remains a fair question for speculation. Our colleges and universities have additional preoccupations today. Once the diffusion of knowledge was limited to a small and select group in society. Today we believe in mass education and reach a point in our wealth and concept of education where it may soon be possible for every American boy and girl who is interested to have a college education, and sometimes it seems to me that the time is coming when a college education of some sort will be needed just to live in this complex society of ours.

Politically we were once a very small nation consisting of a few States strung along the eastern seaboard of the continent. There are now 50 States and some 200 millions of people who have, willy-nilly, assumed certain obligations abroad. Some of those so-called obligations are clear and specific and have been reduced to written agreements, but that is by no means the whole story and I think perhaps it is the smallest part of it. Those obligations represent the changing nature of world society and of our own. They bespeak the fact that increasingly it is impossible to distinguish between the national and the international. One can no longer consider the one without the other. We have moved into a world that is in the process of definition, and we are called upon to be parties to that definition within our historic traditions. The role of the university in specific terms in this new world has not been defined and can only be defined by the universities under the pressure of events and by such intellectually creative work within the universities as will guide events.

We move as a nation into an unknown future as man has always moved into the unknown. At this juncture of history the movement is faster and

the events whirl us along. For better or worse this Nation has been carried to the four corners of the world, and the university has no alternative but to move with the Nation with such speed as it can. In so doing, it takes on no new obligations whatsoever. All that is taking place is an expansion of the horizon of the university and of its obligations within that horizon. It existed yesterday to increase and diffuse knowledge and to fulfill its social responsibilities. It exists for this purpose today and will tomorrow. Its problem is but the ways and means of diffusing and increasing knowledge in a larger world and from a different point of view than it has been previously concerned with, and in fulfilling its responsibilities to a world society.

Our American universities are already fulfilling their responsibilities in this regard. Twenty-seven universities under the leadership of Harvard have agreed to embark upon an ambitious program in cooperation with the Carnegie Corporation, the African-American Institute, and the United States Government to bring African students in great numbers for study and training in this country. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology, with the assistance of the Ford Foundation, is sending eight MIT fellows to Africa to serve as staff assistants in government ministries, industrial corporations, and similar institutions engaged in economic development in Africa.

Finally, it does seem to me that each and every American—that all our institutions are faced with this same challenge, the same need for growth and expansion, so that we can live in a world such as our forefathers could not dream of—a world where time and distance have shrunk, a world that has the possibility of plenty born of our scientific and technological revolution, a world in which nations must live in a degree of intimacy almost akin to that of states in a federal union. The obligation, the responsibility, of the university in the international field will be defined over time by the pragmatic decisions that will be from day to day made in the universities, by theoretical discussion such as this, and I am sure they will be made within the concept of the integrity of the university and of the integrity of the Nation. And as universities increasingly involve themselves in international educational and cultural problems, the university, the Nation, and the world will all benefit tremendously therefrom.

Record Number of Visitors' Visas Issued in Fiscal Year 1960

Press release 558 dated September 26

The Department of State announced on September 26 that a recordbreaking 670,833 visitors' visas were issued during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, to persons desiring to enter the United States temporarily for business, pleasure, education, or other temporary purpose.

In releasing the annual statistics compiled by the Visa Office on nonimmigrant and immigrant visas issued by the Department and the Foreign Service throughout the world, John W. Hanes, Jr., Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, pointed out that the number of

visitors' visas issued was 13 percent higher than the previous year. Mr. Hanes stated that part of this increase undoubtedly reflected the effects of President Eisenhower's designation of the year 1960 as "Visit the United States of America Year." He recalled that the President has assumed a position of leadership in seeking to promote the interchange of friendly visits among the peoples of the world.

A total of 252,641 quota and nonquota immigrant visas were also issued during the 1960 fiscal year to aliens wishing to reside permanently in the United States. More immigrant visas were issued to Canadians (32,558) than to any other nationality. Germans (32,521) came next, followed by Mexicans (30,782) and British (25,587).

IMMIGRANT AND NONIMMIGRANT VISAS ISSUED BY DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICES THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

Fiscal Year 1960

(July 1, 1959, Through June 30, 1960)

Country	Annual quota	Quota visas issued	Nonquota sec. 101 (a) (27) ²	Nonquota symbol K ³	Total immigrant	Nonimmigrant (nationality)	Total immigrant and non-immigrant
Afghanistan	100	26	1	-	27	176	203
Albania	100	93	8	49	150	12	162
Andorra	100	-	-	-	-	1	1
Arabian Peninsula	100	2	-	-	2	18	20
Argentina	-	-	2, 879	-	2, 879	12, 435	15, 314
Asia Pacific	100	93	408	22	523	261	784
Australia	100	91	193	43	327	16, 382	16, 709
Austria	1, 405	1, 314	349	79	1, 742	4, 981	6, 723
Belgium	1, 297	1, 030	74	1	1, 105	4, 732	5, 837
Belgian Congo	-	33	1	-	34	-	34
Bhutan	100	-	-	-	-	1	1
Bolivia	-	-	378	-	378	1, 095	1, 473
Brazil	-	-	1, 373	-	1, 373	12, 511	13, 884
Bulgaria	100	84	18	45	147	125	272
Burma	100	84	1	1	86	420	506
Cambodia	100	1	-	-	1	158	159
Cameroon	100	-	-	-	-	10	10
Cameroun	100	-	1	-	1	8	9
Canada	-	-	32, 558	-	32, 558	2, 490	35, 048
Canal Zone	-	-	1	-	1	-	1
Ceylon	100	67	1	1	69	349	418
Chile	-	-	769	-	769	7, 089	7, 858
China	100	84	1, 467	958	2, 509	5, 367	7, 876
Chinese persons	105	19	-	-	19	-	19
Colombia	-	-	2, 740	-	2, 740	14, 372	17, 112
Costa Rica	-	-	675	-	675	2, 817	3, 492
Cuba	-	-	8, 604	-	8, 604	41, 105	49, 709
Czechoslovakia	2, 859	2, 791	360	19	3, 170	449	3, 619
Danzig	100	95	40	2	137	-	137
Denmark	1, 175	1, 149	228	1	1, 378	8, 125	9, 503
Greenland	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
Dominican Republic	-	-	828	-	828	2, 371	3, 199
Ecuador	-	-	1, 467	-	1, 467	4, 769	6, 236
El Salvador	-	-	1, 018	-	1, 018	3, 371	4, 389
Estonia	115	106	30	17	153	234	387
Ethiopia	100	48	2	-	50	280	330
Finland	566	539	77	18	634	3, 812	4, 446
France	3, 069	2, 797	1, 643	78	4, 518	23, 291	27, 809
Algeria	-	2	2	-	4	-	4
French Guiana	-	-	1	-	1	-	1
French Polynesia	-	3	5	-	8	-	8
French Somaliland	-	4	-	-	4	-	4
Guadeloupe	-	99	10	-	109	-	109

See footnotes at end of table.

IMMIGRANT AND NONIMMIGRANT VISAS ISSUED BY DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICES THROUGHOUT THE WORLD—Con.

Fiscal Year 1960

(July 1, 1959, Through June 30, 1960)

Country	Annual quota	Quota visas issued ¹	Nonquota sec. 101 (a) (27) ²	Nonquota symbol K ³	Total immigrant	Nonimmi- grant (nationality)	Total immi- grant and non- immigrant
France—Continued							
Ivory Coast		-	1	-	1		1
Martinique		26	4	-	30		30
New Caledonia		7	-	-	7		7
Réunion		-	1	-	1		1
St. Pierre and Miquelon		1	4	-	5		5
Senegal		3	-	-	3		3
Germany	25, 814	24, 988	7, 404	129	32, 521	48, 236	80, 757
Ghana	100	27	-	-	27	243	270
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	65, 361	24, 772	779	36	25, 587	84, 809	110, 396
Aden		28	-	-	28		28
Antigua		98	80	4	182		182
Bahamas		100	164	-	264		264
Barbados		97	218	68	383		383
Basutoland		1	-	-	1		1
Bermuda		100	4	-	104		104
British Guiana		78	44	4	126		126
British Honduras		100	37	1	138		138
British Virgin Islands		100	76	18	194		194
Cyprus		91	46	43	180		180
Dominica		79	4	-	83		83
Falkland Islands		4	-	-	4		4
Fiji		3	2	-	5		5
Gambia		1	-	-	1		1
Gibraltar		22	-	-	22		22
Grenada		98	19	1	118		118
Hong Kong		95	5	8	108		108
Jamaica		95	791	160	1, 046		1, 046
Kenya		21	-	2	23		23
Malta		99	74	93	266		266
Mauritius		7	-	-	7		7
Montserrat		100	38	-	138		138
Nigeria		33	-	-	33		33
Northern Rhodesia		10	-	-	10		10
Nyasaland		3	-	-	3		3
St. Christopher		100	44	6	150		150
St. Helena		1	-	-	1		1
St. Lucia		90	9	-	99		99
St. Vincent		100	23	1	124		124
Seychelles		2	-	-	2		2
Sierra Leone		20	1	-	21		21
Singapore		35	2	1	38		38
Somaliland Protectorate		1	-	-	1		1
Southern Rhodesia		32	1	-	33		33
Swaziland		1	-	-	1		1
Tonga		2	-	-	2		2
Trinidad and Tobago		98	225	64	387		387
Uganda		5	-	-	5		5
Greece	308	284	1, 286	1, 598	3, 168	6, 752	9, 920
Guatemala			285	-	285	5, 104	5, 389
Guinea	100	-	-	-	-	51	51
Haiti			985	-	985	3, 160	4, 145
Honduras			707	-	707	2, 300	3, 007
Hungary	865	748	130	920	1, 798	242	2, 040
Iceland	100	99	63	1	163	754	917
India	100	86	88	41	215	6, 759	6, 974
Indonesia	100	85	38	6, 432	6, 555	1, 227	7, 782
Iran	100	47	49	57	153	3, 633	3, 786
Iraq	100	92	43	57	192	843	1, 035
Ireland	17, 756	7, 655	49	-	7, 704	4, 086	11, 790
Israel	100	98	147	116	361	7, 627	7, 988
Italy	5, 666	5, 519	3, 687	5, 896	15, 102	27, 633	42, 735
Japan	185	91	4, 536	617	5, 244	17, 961	23, 205
Jordan	100	94	105	18	217	460	677
Korea	100	30	770	558	1, 358	1, 489	2, 847
Kuwait			1	-	1	56	57
Laos	100	-	1	-	1	107	108
Latvia	235	219	39	54	312	99	411
Lebanon	100	92	158	176	426	2, 097	2, 523
Liberia	100	34	-	-	34	394	428

IMMIGRANT AND NONIMMIGRANT VISAS ISSUED BY DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICES THROUGHOUT THE WORLD—CON.

Fiscal Year 1960

(July 1, 1959, Through June 30, 1960)

Total immi-
grant and non-
immigrant

1
30
7
1
5
3
80,757
270
110,396
28
182
264
383
1
104
126
138
194
180
83
4
5
1
22
118
108
1,046
23
266
7
138
33
10
3
150
1
99
124
2
21
38
33
1
2
387
5
9,920
5,380
51
4,145
3,007
2,040
917
6,974
7,782
3,786
1,035
11,790
7,988
42,735
23,205
677
2,847
57
108
411
2,523
428

Country	Annual quota	Quota visas issued ¹	Nonquota sec. 101 (a) (27) ²	Nonquota symbol K ³	Total immigrant	Nonimmi- grant (nationality)	Total Immi- grant and non- immigrant
Libya.....	100	98	6	1	105	148	253
Liechtenstein.....	100	5	-	-	5	15	20
Lithuania.....	384	368	54	32	454	66	520
Luxembourg.....	100	80	31	2	113	276	389
Malaya.....	100	20	4	-	24	252	276
Mexico.....	-	-	30,782	-	30,782	127,868	158,650
Monaco.....	100	7	-	-	7	8	15
Morocco.....	100	74	144	6	224	428	652
Muscat.....	100	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nauru.....	100	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nepal.....	100	1	-	-	1	85	86
Netherlands.....	3,136	2,901	349	1,169	4,419	20,052	24,471
Netherlands Antilles.....	-	100	10	-	110	-	110
Netherlands New Guinea.....	-	4	-	-	4	-	4
Surinam.....	-	38	8	3	49	-	49
New Guinea.....	100	2	-	-	2	-	2
New Zealand.....	100	80	77	-	157	4,898	5,055
Nicaragua.....	-	-	1,288	-	1,288	2,018	3,306
Norway.....	2,364	2,300	127	-	2,427	11,380	13,807
Pacific Islands.....	100	93	30	-	123	1,264	1,387
Pakistan.....	100	54	27	-	81	1,497	1,578
Palestine.....	100	75	15	115	205	7	212
Panama.....	-	-	1,700	-	1,700	3,032	4,732
Paraguay.....	-	-	48	-	48	350	398
Peru.....	-	-	1,526	-	1,526	5,382	6,908
Philippines.....	100	48	2,267	177	2,492	7,231	9,723
Poland.....	6,488	6,207	1,227	430	7,864	2,037	9,901
Portugal.....	438	389	1,229	5,011	6,629	3,313	9,942
Angola.....	-	1	1	2	4	-	4
Cape Verde Islands.....	-	11	51	30	92	-	92
Goa.....	-	-	1	-	1	-	1
Macao.....	-	2	-	-	2	-	2
Mozambique.....	-	-	2	-	2	-	2
Ruanda-Urundi.....	100	2	-	-	2	-	2
Rumania.....	289	244	125	249	618	150	768
Samoa, Western.....	100	91	3	-	94	138	232
San Marino.....	100	99	6	10	115	12	127
Saudi Arabia.....	100	1	-	-	1	312	312
Somaliland.....	100	1	-	-	1	25	26
South-West Africa.....	100	3	-	-	3	3	6
Spain.....	250	203	872	364	1,439	8,899	10,338
Sudan.....	100	81	1	1	83	148	231
Sweden.....	3,295	2,307	73	-	2,380	8,518	10,898
Switzerland.....	1,698	1,624	148	12	1,784	8,377	10,161
Tanganyika.....	100	11	1	-	12	51	63
Thailand.....	100	62	8	7	77	1,565	1,642
Togo.....	100	1	-	-	1	7	8
Tunisia.....	100	92	25	11	128	262	390
Turkey.....	225	196	184	209	589	2,596	3,185
Union of South Africa.....	100	74	56	-	130	3,032	3,162
U.S.S.R.....	2,697	2,606	138	47	2,791	3,053	5,844
United Arab Republic.....	100	94	111	586	791	2,082	2,873
Uruguay.....	-	-	159	-	159	1,256	1,415
Venezuela.....	-	-	654	-	654	27,115	27,769
Viet-Nam.....	100	43	3	-	46	1,555	1,601
Yemen.....	100	98	3	-	101	10	111
Yugoslavia.....	942	742	393	875	2,010	2,027	4,037
No nationality.....	-	-	-	-	-	8,294	8,294
Total.....	154,887	99,334	125,444	27,863	252,641	* 670,833	923,474

¹ Figures represent actual quota visa issuances by consular offices and do not include quota numbers used for adjustments of status under sec. 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, reductions of quotas by private laws, and other provisions of law.

² Nonquota visas issued pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended.

³ Special nonquota visas issued pursuant to the acts of September 11, 1957 (Public Law 85-316, as amended), September 2, 1958 (Public Law 85-892), and September 22, 1959 (Public Law 86-363).

⁴ Includes nonimmigrant visas revalidated.

BREAKDOWN AND TOTAL OF VISAS ISSUED BY DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICES THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

Fiscal Years 1946 Through 1960

Fiscal year	Immigrant		Total	Nonimmigrant	Nonimmigrant revalidations	Total	Grand total
	Quota ¹	Nonquota					
1946.....	37,083	47,327	84,410	247,672	5,306	252,978	337,388
1947.....	78,873	66,844	145,717	313,279	32	313,311	459,028
1948.....	93,222	72,869	166,091	309,730	2,164	311,894	477,985
1949.....	^a 133,839	^b 70,096	203,935	261,071	7,487	268,558	472,493
1950.....	^c 205,365	^d 63,541	268,906	242,784	11,199	253,983	522,889
1951.....	^e 170,166	^f 61,137	231,303	271,706	23,108	294,814	526,117
1952.....	^g 180,660	^h 88,286	268,946	318,872	21,017	339,889	608,835
1953.....	ⁱ 87,211	94,306	181,517	349,388	11,990	361,378	542,895
1954.....	^j 86,356	^k 122,866	209,222	399,994	18,197	418,191	627,413
1955.....	81,027	^l 163,844	244,871	420,095	24,943	445,038	689,909
1956.....	86,449	^m 245,958	332,407	425,421	70,666	496,087	828,494
1957.....	97,684	ⁿ 219,728	317,412	501,692	87,495	589,187	906,599
1958.....	105,474	^o 154,450	259,924	530,857	81,967	612,824	872,748
1959.....	94,805	^p 130,128	224,933	508,634	86,445	595,079	820,012
1960.....	99,334	^q 153,307	252,641	581,122	89,711	670,833	923,474

¹ Figures represent actual quota visa issuances by consular offices and do not include quota numbers used for adjustments of status under sec. 245 of the act, reductions of quotas by private laws, and other provisions of law.

^a Includes 55,639 quota visas issued pursuant to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended.

^b Includes 339 nonquota visas issued pursuant to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended.

^c Includes 131,901 quota visas issued pursuant to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended.

^d Includes 261 nonquota visas issued pursuant to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended.

^e Includes 104,571 quota visas issued pursuant to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended.

^f Includes 747 nonquota visas issued pursuant to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended.

^g Includes 106,497 quota visas issued pursuant to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended.

^h Includes 3,037 nonquota visas issued pursuant to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended.

ⁱ Includes 459 (shepherders) quota visas issued under Public Law 307 (82d Cong.) and 5,089 cases of aliens who enjoyed a preference under sec. 3(c) of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended.

^j Includes 5,722 cases of aliens who enjoyed a preference under sec. 3(c) of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended.

^k Includes 500 nonquota visas issued to orphans under Public Law 162 (83d Cong.) and 5,633 nonquota visas issued pursuant to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended.

^l Includes 353 nonquota visas issued under Public Law 770 (shepherders) 83d Cong., 2d sess., and 32,009 nonquota visas issued pursuant to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended.

^m Includes 32 nonquota visas issued under Public Law 770 (shepherders) 83d Cong., 2d sess., and 84,151 visas issued under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended.

ⁿ Includes 68,442 nonquota visas issued under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended.

^o Includes 27,337 nonquota Symbol K visas issued pursuant to the act of Sept. 11, 1957 (Public Law 85-316).

^p Includes 25,608 nonquota Symbol K visas issued pursuant to the acts of Sept. 11, 1957 (Public Law 85-316), and Sept. 2, 1958 (Public Law 85-892).

^q Includes 27,863 nonquota Symbol K visas issued pursuant to the acts of Sept. 11, 1957 (Public Law 85-316, as amended), Sept. 2, 1958 (Public Law 85-892), and Sept. 22, 1959 (Public Law 86-363).

Immigration Quotas Established for Fourteen New Nations

White House press release dated September 24

WHITE HOUSE ANNOUNCEMENT

The President has signed a proclamation establishing annual immigration quotas of 100 each for the Republic of Cameroun, which came into existence on January 1, 1960, upon the termination of the United Nations trusteeship, for the Republic of Togo, which was established on April 27, 1960,

upon the termination of the United Nations trusteeship, and for the new African states of the Malagasy Republic, the Central African Republic, the Republic of Chad, the Republic of Congo (former Middle Congo), the Republic of Dahomey, the Gabon Republic, the Republic of Ivory Coast, the Republic of Niger, and the Republic of Upper Volta, all of which were formerly autonomous republics within the French Community and which were granted independence by France within the period of June 26 to August 17, 1960. The proclamation signed by the President also establishes an annual quota of 100 for the

Republic of the Congo, the former Belgian Congo, which was granted independence by Belgium on June 30, 1960, for the Somali Republic, which came into existence on July 1, 1960, by the union of the former Italian Trust Territory of Somaliland and the former British Somaliland, and for the Republic of Cyprus, a former British crown colony, which was granted independence by the Government of the United Kingdom on August 16, 1960.

TEXT OF PROCLAMATION¹

IMMIGRATION QUOTAS

WHEREAS under the provisions of section 202(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, each independent country, self-governing dominion, mandated territory, and territory under the international trusteeship system of the United Nations, other than independent countries of North, Central, and South America, is entitled to be treated as a separate quota area when approved by the Secretary of State; and

WHEREAS under the provisions of section 201(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General, jointly, are required to determine the annual quota of any quota area established pursuant to the provisions of section 201(a) of the said Act, and to report to the President the quota of each quota area so determined; and

WHEREAS under the provisions of section 202(e) of the said Act, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General, jointly, are required to revise the quotas, whenever necessary, to provide for any political changes requiring a change in the list of quota areas; and

WHEREAS the Republic of Cameroun came into existence on January 1, 1960, with the termination of the United Nations Trusteeship; and

WHEREAS the Republic of Togo was established on April 27, 1960, upon the termination of the United Nations Trusteeship; and

WHEREAS the Malagasy Republic, a former Autonomous Republic of the French Community, became independent on June 26, 1960; and

WHEREAS the Republic of the Congo, the former Belgian Congo, was granted independence by Belgium on June 30, 1960; and

WHEREAS the Somali Republic came into existence on July 1, 1960, by the union of the former Italian Trust Territory of Somaliland and the former British Somaliland; and

WHEREAS the Central African Republic, the Republic of Chad, the Republic of Congo (former Middle Congo), the Republic of Dahomey, the Gabon Republic, the Republic of Ivory Coast, the Republic of Niger, and the

Republic of Upper Volta, previously Autonomous Republics within the French Community, were granted independence by France between August 1 and August 17, 1960; and

WHEREAS the Republic of Cyprus, the former British Crown Colony of Cyprus, was granted independence by the Government of the United Kingdom on August 16, 1960; and

WHEREAS the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General have jointly determined and reported to me the immigration quotas hereinafter set forth:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States of America, acting under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the aforesaid Act of Congress, do hereby proclaim and make known that the annual quotas of the quota areas hereinafter designated have been determined in accordance with the law to be, and shall be, as follows:

Quota area	Quota
Cameroun.....	100
Central African Republic.....	100
Chad.....	100
Congo.....	100
Congo, Republic of the.....	100
Cyprus.....	100
Dahomey.....	100
Gabon.....	100
Ivory Coast.....	100
Malagasy Republic.....	100
Niger.....	100
Somali Republic.....	100
Togo.....	100
Upper Volta.....	100

The establishment of an immigration quota for any quota area is solely for the purpose of compliance with the pertinent provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act and is not to be considered as having any significance extraneous to such purpose.

Proclamation No. 3298 of June 3, 1959, entitled "Immigration Quotas,"² is amended by the abolishment of the immigration quotas established for Cameroun (trust territory, France), Somaliland (trust territory, Italy), Togo (trust territory, France), and by the addition of the immigration quotas established by this proclamation.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this twenty-third day of September in the year of our Lord nineteen [SEAL] hundred and sixty and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-fifth.

Dwight D. Eisenhower

By the President:
DOUGLAS DILLON,
Acting Secretary of State.

¹ No. 3372; 25 *Fed. Reg.* 9283.

² For text, see BULLETIN of July 6, 1959, p. 19.

U.S. Commends Secretary-General on Reply to Soviet Attack

Following is a statement made on October 3 by U.S. Representative James J. Wadsworth when he was asked to comment upon an address by Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld before the U.N. General Assembly on that date. Mr. Hammarskjöld defended his actions as Secretary-General against charges by Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, who in an address to the General Assembly on October 3 asked for the resignation of Mr. Hammarskjöld and a reorganization of the office of the Secretary-General.

U.S. delegation press release 3518

Mr. Hammarskjöld showed tremendous courage. I am sure Mr. Khrushchev was not happy about this speech—as was shown by his pounding his desk.

Mr. Hammarskjöld's statement that he will stay to the end of his term is a very fine augury for the future.

Modifications proposed by Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Nkrumah,¹ which in each case amount to government by committee, will not work. Mr. Khrushchev's proposal for a three-man committee to run the Organization is the most ludicrous thing I have ever heard and if taken seriously shows a determination to destroy the United Nations.

Puerto Rico Refutes Charges of U.S. Colonialism by Cuba and U.S.S.R.

U.S. delegation press release 3513 dated September 29

Following is the text of a letter from Ambassador James J. Wadsworth, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, to Ambassador Frederick H. Boland, President of the General Assembly, transmitting a letter and message from Luis Muñoz

¹ Kwame Nkrumah, President of Ghana, addressed the General Assembly on Sept. 23.

Marín, Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, to the President of the General Assembly and to all members of the United Nations.

LETTER OF AMBASSADOR WADSWORTH

SEPTEMBER 28, 1960

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to enclose a letter in both the English and Spanish languages which I have received from the Honorable Luis Muñoz Marín, Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relating to statements made in the General Debate concerning Puerto Rico. He has asked that I make known to you and to all members of the United Nations the views of the Commonwealth Government as set forth in a message which Governor Muñoz Marín attached to his letter.

I would be grateful if you would arrange to have Governor Muñoz Marín's letter and his message circulated to the members of the General Assembly.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

JAMES J. WADSWORTH

His Excellency
MR. FREDERICK H. BOLAND
President of the Fifteenth Session
of the General Assembly.

LETTER OF GOVERNOR MUNOZ MARIN

SEPTEMBER 27, 1960

CHAIRMAN OF THE UNITED STATES DELEGATION
TO THE UNITED NATIONS
2 Park Avenue
New York 16, N.Y.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In view of the charges of United States colonialism against Puerto Rico raised at the General Assembly of the United Nations by the Soviet and the Cuban delegations, I should appreciate your making known to the President of the General Assembly and to all mem-

bers of the United Nations the views of the Commonwealth Government which I have included in the attached message.

Sincerely,

LUIS MUÑOZ MARÍN

Enclosure

September 27, 1960

MESSAGE FROM THE HONORABLE LUIS MUNOZ MARIN, GOVERNOR OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO, TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

In view of the charges of United States colonialism against Puerto Rico, raised at the General Assembly of the United Nations by the Soviet and Cuban delegations, I have the honor of bringing to your attention the following views of the Commonwealth Government.

The people of Puerto Rico strongly adhere to the democratic way of life, based on the respect of minority rights, the protection and furtherance of individual freedoms, and the effective exercise of the right to vote in free, unhindered elections. There can be no genuine self-determination unless these conditions are met.

Puerto Rico has truly and effectively met them and it has freely chosen its present relationship with the United States. The people of Puerto Rico are a self-governing people freely associated to the United States of America on the basis of mutual consent and respect. The policies regarding the cultural and economic development of Puerto Rico are in the hands of the people of Puerto Rico themselves for them to determine according to their best interests.

The United Nations General Assembly, by Resolution of November 1953, has solemnly recognized that the people of Puerto Rico effectively exercised their right to self-determination in establishing the Commonwealth as an autonomous political entity on a mutually agreed association with the United States.¹ In further regard to the principle of self-determination, the Commonwealth Legislative Assembly has approved this very year a law authorizing another vote on Puerto Rico's status whenever 10 per cent of the electors request it.

More than 13,000 visitors and trainees from all over the world, including thousands from the new states in Africa and Asia now represented at the United Nations, have seen with their own eyes the social and economic achievements of the Commonwealth under free, democratic institutions. As an example of Puerto Rico's great forward strides as a Commonwealth, the rate of growth of the net Commonwealth income in 1959 was 9.4%, one of the highest in the entire world.

The People of Puerto Rico fully support the United Nations as a symbol of a world order, ruled by law and the principle of self-determination, and hope that through the United Nations a militant campaign for peace is developed that would avoid the nuclear extinction of our civilization.

¹ For background and text of the resolution, see BULLETIN of Dec. 14, 1953, p. 841.

U.S. Requests Inclusion of Item on Africa in U.N. Agenda

Following is a statement by James J. Wadsworth, U.S. Representative, made in the General Committee on September 28, together with the text of a letter from Mr. Wadsworth to Secretary-General Hammarskjöld requesting inclusion of an item on Africa in the agenda of the 15th regular session of the U.N. General Assembly.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR WADSWORTH

U.S. delegation press release 3511

The United States requests inclusion of an additional item of an important and urgent character entitled "Africa: A United Nations Program for Independence and Development." This request is a natural result of the desire of my Government, as expressed to the General Assembly by President Eisenhower on September 22,¹ to achieve the objectives of the United Nations Charter in the continent of Africa.

The United States seeks the inscription of this new item in order to encourage constructive debate and positive results at the 15th session of the General Assembly.

In our view a broad United Nations program of assistance is needed urgently, one in which all members may participate to the benefit of human progress in Africa.

Proposals for achieving these goals were presented, as I say, by President Eisenhower and are included in the explanatory memorandum which members of this committee will find before them in document A/4515. I trust that the committee will find it possible to include this in their recommendation for inscription.

TEXT OF LETTER

U.S. delegation press release 3509

SEPTEMBER 28, 1960

DEAR MR. SECRETARY-GENERAL: On behalf of the Government of the United States, I have the honor to request inclusion of the following additional item of an important and urgent character, under Rule 15 of the General Assembly's Rules of

¹ BULLETIN of Oct. 10, 1960, p. 551.

Procedure, in the agenda of the Fifteenth Regular Session:

"Africa: A United Nations Program for Independence and Development".

In accordance with Rule 20 of the Rules of Procedure, an explanatory memorandum is attached to this letter.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

JAMES J. WADSWORTH

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

In his statement before the General Assembly on 22 September, 1960, the President of the United States proposed a five-point program for assistance to the new countries of Africa. United Nations action is required, the President stated, "because the drive of self-determination and of rising human aspirations is creating a new world of independent nations of Africa, even as it is producing a new world of both ferment and of promise in all developing areas. An awakening humanity in these regions demands as never before that we make a renewed attack on poverty, illiteracy and disease."

The challenges of peace and orderly progress in freedom can best be met by the combined efforts of the world community operating through the United Nations. The United States has already made substantial direct contributions to the development of new countries and will continue to do so, but the efforts of any one country or group of countries are insufficient to raise all the funds, provide all the skills and assure the complete impartiality of action required by the new nations. It is imperative that the international community protect the newly emerging countries of Africa from outside pressures that threaten their independence and sovereign rights and that retard their development in all fields.

The new African states which have become members of the United Nations at this session as well as the others who will be admitted later this year and in 1961 have the right to choose their own way of life and to determine for themselves the course they wish to follow. The United States believes that all member states should pledge themselves to refrain from intervening in the internal affairs of these nations, to refrain from generating disputes between them and to desist

from all actions designed to intensify or exploit present unsettled conditions in the Congo.

The United Nations should make it clear that it is prepared to assure the security of the new African states and to help them avoid wasteful competition in armaments through appropriate machinery, thus helping them to free their resources for more constructive purposes. As a token of willingness to cooperate in such a program, the United States hopes that member states will pledge substantial resources to the international program of assistance to the Congo organized by the Secretary General.

United Nations institutions and affiliated organizations should help African countries to shape their long-term development programs, in order to assist in their war against poverty, illiteracy and disease. The United Nations Special Fund and expanded Technical Assistance Program should be increased so that in combination they can reach their annual \$100,000,000 goal in 1961. The Special Fund's functions should be expanded so that it can assist countries in planning economic development. Similarly, the United Nations Operational and Executive Personnel Program for making available trained administrators to the new countries should be placed on a permanent basis. The World Bank and International Monetary Fund should be encouraged increasingly to provide counsel and timely assistance to the new states, as they qualify for aid.

Inasmuch as national independence is an essential step toward the ultimate goal of individual freedom, an expanded all-out United Nations effort to assist in educational advancement should be undertaken. As part of this effort, the family of United Nations organizations in the educational field should collaborate with the new African states to assist and establish such new or expanded programs as they might desire.

The Government of the United States of America believes that these and similar proposals would, if implemented vigorously, go far towards placing the independence of the new African states on the soundest possible footing. In the words of the Charter, a United Nations program for Africa would help "to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples..." It would also be a manifestation of "international cooperation in solving international problems of

an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all . . ." In serving the cause of human progress in dignity and freedom in Africa, the United Nations would be serving the highest aspirations of mankind.

In order to achieve the foregoing objectives, the United States is accordingly submitting an item entitled "Africa: A United Nations Program for Independence and Development".

Federation of Nigeria Admitted to U.N. Membership

Following are statements made on October 7 by Secretary Herter in the Security Council and by U.S. Representative Francis O. Wilcox in plenary session on the application of the Federation of Nigeria for membership in the United Nations.¹

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY HERTER

U.S./U.N. press release 3521

Since I will be unable to attend the meeting of the General Assembly this afternoon to participate at the ceremonies there which we all anticipate with so much pleasure, I asked for the privilege of participating in the meeting of the Security Council this morning. I could not ask for a more pleasant occasion to make my debut than the present one, when we are being asked to recommend to the General Assembly that the Federation of Nigeria be admitted to United Nations membership. The United States endorses this recommendation with great pleasure.

This is perhaps a good time to look briefly at the remarkable renaissance which is going on in Africa. I feel certain that historians when they examine the events of this year will single out as the outstanding political fact of the year, if not, indeed, of the decade, the remarkable advancement of political freedom in Africa. Other events may cause more passing furor, but the achievement of

independence by 16 new African states during the first 10 months of 1960 is one of the stirring phenomena of our days. Today virtually all of west Africa is either independent or soon to achieve independence.

The people of Nigeria have won their independence, but they have won our warmest admiration by the way they have gone about the winning of it. They have done it by demonstrating, time and again and in many fields, that Nigerians are anxious to enjoy the satisfactions of independence and fully capable of assuming its responsibilities. They have done it also by reaching agreement among themselves on the form and structure of their federation in one of the most constructive acts of statesmanship of the past decade.

When the green and white Nigerian flag was raised at one minute past midnight on October 1, it marked the culmination of a process which began nearly a century ago.

During a recent visit to New York a distinguished Nigerian said:

Our country presents a picture of political stability. There is no absence of politics, and at times controversy runs high, as it does in any free country, but the basic factor in our political life is stability. We have not rushed unprepared into independence, but we have advanced step by step over the years. . . .

Through the enlightened policies of Great Britain, Nigerians have been trained in ever larger numbers for the responsibilities of leadership. This policy has been carried out right here at the United Nations, where Nigerian officials have for a number of years followed United Nations activities closely as members of United Kingdom delegations. Today they are thoroughly familiar with the practices and procedures of the United Nations and will be able to make an important contribution to our work without delay. Already Nigeria has agreed to send a battalion to the Congo to join the United Nations Force there, which is a signal service which we all applaud warmly.

It is no exaggeration to say that the world has watched Nigeria's progress toward independence with unparalleled attention. Certainly few recent events have so captured the imagination of the American people. This, I believe, is due to a number of related reasons.

First, Nigeria is the most populous country on the African Continent, containing about 15 percent of Africa's total population.

¹The Security Council on Oct. 7 unanimously recommended the admission of the Federation of Nigeria, and on the same day the General Assembly admitted it by acclamation.

Secondly, Nigeria, with its great size and diversity, has become a functioning federation. To operate a federal structure effectively, as our 170 years of experience with this system of government shows, requires a willingness to accept diversity and to cultivate a spirit of accommodation and conciliation. Nigerians have already abundantly demonstrated these qualities. They have adopted a course of freedom and equality for all ethnic groups. This, we believe, is the real road to lasting national unity.

Thirdly, Nigeria has all the muscle and sinew required for great economic expansion. Not only does it possess great natural resources, but its people are hard working. Moreover, its Government, with its kind of experience and dedicated officers, can be expected to follow wise economic policies. With these essential ingredients for economic development, and with the assistance of the United Nations and of its friends—among whom the United States is proud to count itself—economic advancement can be confidently expected.

Nigeria will face serious challenges in the development of its new state. We believe, however, that Nigeria has the men, the resources, and the will to succeed.

But Nigeria can accomplish more than national fulfillment, important though this is. It has a role to play in Africa as well. It enters upon independent life at a time when the African Continent is alive to the needs for closer cooperation and searching for the proper forms to express it. Nigeria, with its unity formed from diversity and its dedication to freedom, can do much to point the proper way toward a wider unity.

We have with us today Nigeria's Federal Prime Minister, Alhaji Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, and the members of his delegation. He has impressed all who have met him with his wisdom and political realism. On many occasions he has given generously of his time to Americans visiting his country, and therefore I am particularly pleased to welcome him to these shores.

Mr. President, the United States will vote with great satisfaction for the resolution² submitted by the United Kingdom, Tunisia, and Ceylon recommending that the Federation of Nigeria be admitted to membership in the United Nations.

² U.N. doc. S/4548.

STATEMENT BY MR. WILCOX

U.S. delegation press release 3522

This morning in the Security Council Secretary of State Herter spoke at some length about the reasons why the United States considers this such an auspicious day. It is Nigeria's day at the United Nations, and there could not be very many better reasons for joy than that.

But as Secretary Herter said this morning, we believe Nigeria's day here gives us also the occasion to contemplate the truly remarkable renaissance that is going on in all of Africa and to applaud the vital forces of liberty and national dignity which are reaching floodtide there.

Indeed, I would go so far as to say that the rapid advance of political freedom in Africa constitutes one of the most important developments of the 20th century. Never before in history have so many independent states emerged upon the world scene in such a short period of time.

We in the United States cannot help but be profoundly moved by these developments. Many millions of our citizens have their racial origins in Africa. The United States itself is a young country. We know from intimate experience what it means to forge a nation from a population of diverse origin and experience. We know also from firsthand experience of the exhilaration which can come from hard work and cooperative effort which newly won independence can inspire.

Nigeria begins its national life with many advantages and with many friends. We have just heard warm speeches of welcome from Nigeria's partners in the Commonwealth.

The United States salutes the United Kingdom and the other members of the Commonwealth on this day when the newest member enters the United Nations. But most of all, Mr. President, we bid a warm and cordial welcome to Nigeria, its people, and its leaders. We look forward to a valuable and cooperative association with Nigeria in the important work of the United Nations.

Mr. President, in our country we have watched Nigeria progress toward independence with great attention and admiration. We extend our hearty congratulations and our sincere best wishes to the Government and people of that great land for continued progress in the years that lie ahead.

The 1960 United Nations Conference on Tin

by C. W. Nichols

The 1960 United Nations Conference on Tin met at the headquarters of the United Nations, at New York, from May 23 to June 24. It was the third negotiation to be convened under the auspices of the U.N. for the purpose of establishing an intergovernmental agreement to regulate international trade in tin.

The other two negotiating conferences had been arranged at the request of the International Tin Study Group, which had the world tin situation under very active review during the years 1947-53.¹ The members of the Study Group were governments of countries which were substantially interested in the production or consumption of tin.

The first of these conferences, held in 1950, was unable to reach an agreement. The second was held late in 1953 and established the text of an agreement which was opened for signature on behalf of governments as of March 1, 1954.² This is the existing International Tin Agreement, which entered into force on July 1, 1956, and is scheduled to expire on June 30, 1961.

The present agreement is administered by the International Tin Council, in which all governments participating in the agreement are represented. The Council gave consideration during the years 1958 and 1959 to the need for a continuing program of international control and decided that the present agreement should be succeeded by a second agreement, which should take effect without any lapse or interval.

The Council thereupon requested the United Na-

tions to convene a conference for the consideration of a second agreement. The Secretary-General of the U.N., on the advice of the Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements, extended invitations to governments and circulated, as a basis for discussions at the Conference, the draft of a new agreement which had been prepared by a technical committee of the International Tin Council.

The world market for tin had, of course, known international control arrangements of various kinds from time to time long before the establishment of the United Nations. The earliest of those were negotiated and administered by private companies without the official participation of governments. Later arrangements were official in character and had as participants the governments of countries which accounted for the bulk of world production and exports.

Governments of consuming countries, as well as those of producing countries, participated in the administration of programs for international allocation of tin during World War II and the early postwar period.

During the decade of the 1940's there came to be general acceptance of the principle that international commodity control arrangements should be open to the governments of countries having a substantial interest in consumption or trade as well as those which are principally interested in production.

• *Mr. Nichols is Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs. He was the observer for the United States at the 1960 U.N. Conference on Tin.*

¹ For an article by Mr. Nichols on the Study Group, see BULLETIN of May 18, 1953, p. 724.

² For an article by Mr. Nichols on the 1953 Conference, see *ibid.*, Feb. 15, 1954, p. 239.

The institutional arrangements and methods of operation have changed very greatly, but some of the interests involved and the general objectives of present controls have much in common with the earlier international schemes for tin.

Tin is produced principally in underdeveloped countries; revenues derived from its sale are very important to several of them. World consumption of tin has experienced less growth than that of other raw materials. World production of tin is largely concentrated in a few countries which have small consumption but export the bulk of their output. Neither production nor consumption responds readily to a modest change in price. In the absence of regulation, the market for tin has been subject to extreme price fluctuations and these have sometimes had very adverse effects not only in producing countries but also in consuming countries.

Problems of International Control

All of the international tin arrangements have sought to reduce the tendency of the tin market toward excessive instability of price. While the need for greater stability has not been widely challenged, there have been differences of opinion concerning the best means to that end, and these questions continue to be subject to debate.

There is danger that controls which are undertaken for the purpose of price stabilization may inhibit increased productivity and place undue restriction on the development of more economical production. The significant effects on prices might not be limited to the smoothing of extreme swings. There is some concern and some evidence that price stabilization programs raise the average price over a representative period of time. The maintenance of high prices could put an unreasonable burden on consumers and jeopardize the longer term interests of efficient producers in an expansion of consumption.

These reservations concerning the various kinds of international controls which have been applied to tin raise questions which are difficult to resolve.

Consideration must be given to the vulnerability of underdeveloped countries to short-term fluctuations of commodity prices. These are characteristically more extreme than would be necessary to warn producers and consumers of the future needs of the market. The countries which are

the principal producers of tin have a clear need for more income and capital. Tin is consumed principally in industrialized countries which have achieved a level of income that is generally higher than that of the producing countries and is not heavily dependent on the price of tin.

Most proponents of the tin agreement insist that it is not the intention or the desire to raise the level of the market price, on the average, over a period of time. However, it appears that this has been the effect and that this is the prospect under a continuation of such regulation. The revenues derived from the export of tin seem to be higher in the short and medium term, at the expense of consumers, than would otherwise be the case. The longer term effects are less clear. These will depend upon the impact of the controls themselves upon the future volume of consumption, the trend of prospecting and development, and other circumstances which are not readily predictable.

The apparent short-run advantage which the agreement offers to the producing countries is, within limits, considered by some to be a justifiable form of international cooperation in view of the broad international interest in the economic progress of those countries. Others emphasize, however, that much of the additional payments exacted from consumers of tin by the operation of the agreement does not get back to projects and programs of economic development which have broad national interest in the producing countries and which constitute the subject of particular international concern. It would seem likely that only a part of the special addition to export revenues which accrues from the operation of the agreement gets back to basic economic development, and that part might be seen to be relatively small if it were possible to trace all of the transfers and alternatives.

Some opinion, of course, takes direct issue with the basic proposition that an international commodity control agreement should not raise the average price, contending instead that the circumstances under which tin and other primary commodities are produced and marketed tend—in the absence of regulatory machinery—toward persistent deterioration in the economic position of primary-product producers and an inequitable relationship to manufacturing industries and the prices of fabricated goods.

Basic Elements of Second Agreement

Invitations to the Tin Conference of 1960 were sent to all governments which are members of the United Nations, the Interim Commission for the International Trade Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N., and the International Tin Council.³ Twenty-three governments were represented by delegates. Observers were present to represent 12 other governments and 4 international organizations.

The United States had participated in the negotiations of 1950 and 1953 but was represented in the 1960 conference by an observer, since this Government was not participating in the existing agreement and did not expect to become a signatory to the second agreement.

The new agreement which was prepared by this Conference is similar in its basic elements to the present control program.

The proposed second agreement provides for a price range and seeks to prevent excessive fluctuations by attempting to keep the price of tin on the London Metal Exchange within the limits of this range as established by the agreement or subsequently revised by the Council. The stabilization objectives are sought partly through the operation of a buffer stock but principally through the authority of the Council to establish quantitative restrictions on exports from producing countries which participate in the agreement. The Council is also empowered to make recommendations to participating countries in the event of a tin shortage.

³ Delegates attended for all of the producing countries in the present agreement (Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi, Bolivia, Indonesia, Malaya, Nigeria, and Thailand) and for the following countries which participate in this agreement as consumers: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, India, Italy, Korea, the Netherlands, Spain, Turkey, and the United Kingdom. Delegates also attended for five countries which do not participate in the present agreement: the Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, Japan, Mexico, and the United Arab Republic.

Israel, a participant in the present agreement, was not represented at the Conference; Austria, also a participant, was represented by an observer. Observers were also present for Brazil, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Norway, Peru, Rumania, Sweden, the U.S.S.R., the United States, Venezuela, Viet-Nam, the International Labor Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the International Monetary Fund.

Many consuming interests have considered that the midpoint of the price range in the present agreement is above the average price which might reasonably be expected to materialize over a representative period of time in the absence of controls. They notice that the supply of tin on the world market has been restricted by the continuation of export quotas under the agreement even when demand was at levels generally considered to be normal or above. Their viewpoint is in conflict, of course, with the desire of some producing interests that the agreement should have a target price range even higher than it has at present.

The Conference decided that the initial prices in the second agreement will be £730-£880 sterling per long ton (91¼¢-\$1.10 per pound), unless other prices are in force at the date of the termination of the first agreement, in which case these other prices would be substituted. The "ceiling" of £880 sterling, therefore, continues for the present as it was negotiated in 1953. The "floor" price of £640 sterling which was negotiated originally in the first agreement was raised to £730 sterling by vote of the International Tin Council in 1957.

Enlarged Powers of Council

The specific provisions of the second agreement differ in numerous aspects from those in the first agreement.

The Council is given considerably greater discretion. It will be authorized to change the three sectors which subdivide the price range for purposes of buffer-stock operations. The Council will also be authorized to suspend buffer-stock operations. The additional flexibility of the second agreement includes other new authorities for the Council, such as power to reduce the quantity of metal which the buffer stock must hold as a prerequisite for the control of exports, to borrow funds for buffer stock operations, and to pledge assets of the buffer stock for such loans.

The enlarged powers of the Council will also include new authorities for temporary reallocation (with the consent of the countries concerned) of the shares which producing countries have in the total of permissible exports; for extension of the duration of the agreement for a period or periods up to 1 additional year beyond 5 years; and for the determination of the length of time, up to 1 year, during which the second agreement may be provisionally in force on the basis of notifications

by governments of their intention to accept and in the absence of the specified minimum number of completed formal acceptances.

The size of the buffer stock will be reduced from the 25,000 tons specified in the first agreement to 20,000 tons in the second agreement. This reduces more or less proportionately the capacity of that stock to safeguard consumers against the danger that export restrictions established on the basis of estimates of future demand might prove in fact to be overly severe in relation to actual demand. Safeguards for consumer interests are also weakened by the reduction from 10,000 tons to 5,000 tons in the amount of metal which must be held in the buffer stock as a precondition for the establishment of export controls after a period in which controls are not in effect.

Bolivia and Indonesia would start the second agreement with somewhat smaller shares of the total permissible exports than they had at the outset of the first agreement. The percentages of both countries had already been reduced, and the percentages of other exporting countries increased, by decisions taken in the administration of the first agreement. The initial percentages of the respective producing countries under the second agreement would not be changed very much from the actual percentages which they have in 1960-61, the final year of the present agreement.

The second agreement eliminates the obligation which was placed on the Council by the first agreement to consider annually a limited reallocation of producing countries' percentages with a view toward providing relatively increasing opportunities for more effective suppliers. The second agreement substitutes new provisions under which a redetermination of these percentages will be made from time to time in proportion to the actual production of the countries concerned in periods of four or more consecutive quarters during which exports are not controlled. No redetermination would occur if exports were controlled in parts of each period of 12 consecutive months. The effects might be similar to those of the original provision, but the new provision might also encourage some producing countries to associate themselves with consuming countries in allowing periods of freedom in relatively balanced market situations, thereby reducing any danger that the Council might be unduly reluctant to remove ex-

port restrictions completely except in an unusually strong market.

The second agreement will be open for signature at London from September 1, 1960, until December 31, 1960, by governments which were represented at the Conference this year. The agreement will enter into force on July 1, 1961, if a sufficient number of signatory governments accept or ratify to meet the minimum requirements of nine consuming countries and six producing countries entitled to specified numbers of votes in the new Council.

If the original entry into force is provisional, by virtue of being based on notifications of intention rather than on completed acceptances, additional ratifications or acceptances will bring the agreement definitively into force within a year after July 1, 1961, if they are sufficient to reach the required minimum of formal acceptances. If there are not enough acceptances, the agreement will terminate not later than June 30, 1962.

Assuming that the agreement enters definitively into force, its duration, except in certain specified special circumstances, would be 5 years, during which period accession would be open to any government with the consent of, and upon conditions to be determined by, the Council.

United States Delegations to International Conferences

11th Session of the UNESCO General Conference

The Department of State announced on September 26 (press release 559) that President Eisenhower had on that day appointed the following persons to be U.S. representatives to the 11th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), to be held at Paris from November 14 to December 13, 1960:

Robert H. Thayer, *chairman*, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for the Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Relations

William S. Dix, *vice chairman*, librarian of Princeton University and chairman of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO

Bertha S. Adkins, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

Horace E. Henderson, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs

George N. Shuster, U.S. member of UNESCO Executive Board

In addition to two congressional advisers, who will be designated, the principal adviser to the U.S. delegation will be Henry J. Kellermann, U.S. Permanent Representative to UNESCO in Paris.

Other members of the U.S. delegation will include:

Advisers

Frederick H. Burkhardt, president, American Council of Learned Societies

Alfred De Grazia, chairman, Institute of Applied Social Science Research, New York University

Frank England, Office of International Conferences, Department of State

Magdalen Flexner, American Embassy, Paris

Harry Goldberg, International Affairs Department, AFL-CIO

James F. Hughes, American Embassy, Paris

Frank Maria, labor-management consultant, Lowell, Mass.

L. Arthur Minnich, Jr., director, secretariat of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO

John H. Moore, Office of International Administration, Department of State

E. Frederic Morrow, administrative officer (special projects), Executive Office of the President

Joseph B. Platt, president, Harvey Mudd College

Wilbur L. Schramm, director, Institute of Communications Research, Stanford University

James Simsarian, Office of International Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State

Fredericka M. Tandler, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Andy G. Wilkison, secretariat of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO

William B. Young, Office of International Conferences, Department of State

The General Conference is UNESCO's governing body. It consists of delegates from each of the 82-member states and meets once every 2 years to study and adopt the program and budget and to decide on major policy issues. An Executive Board, elected by the General Conference, supervises the execution of the program between sessions of the General Conference.

For the 1961-62 biennium, the Director General, Vittorino Veronese, has presented a program calling for an appropriation from member states of approximately \$29 million, about a 13.5 percent increase over 1959-60.

UNESCO proposes during 1961-62 to concentrate its efforts and resources on those activities which will contribute optimum results to the advancement of peace and international understanding. These activities include the continuing campaign to eradicate illiteracy, to encourage

scientific cooperation, particularly in arid-zones research and oceanography, to develop mass-media techniques in the emerging nations, and to encourage appreciation of the cultures of all member states. In this field UNESCO is spearheading an international campaign to preserve the historic sites and monuments of the Nubia, an area which will be flooded when the Aswan Dam is constructed.

In the deliberations of the General Conference at Paris in November, special consideration will be given to the urgent need for larger educational facilities in Asia, the Near East, and Africa.

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Atomic Energy

Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Done at New York October 26, 1956. Entered into force July 29, 1957. TIAS 3873.

Ratification deposited: Colombia, September 30, 1960.

Automotive Traffic

Convention on road traffic with annexes, and protocol concerning countries or territories at present occupied. Done at Geneva September 19, 1949. Entered into force March 26, 1952. TIAS 2487.

Accession deposited: Chile, August 10, 1960.¹

Customs convention on the temporary importation of private road vehicles. Done at New York June 4, 1954. Entered into force December 15, 1957. TIAS 3943.

Extension to: British Honduras, September 12, 1960.

Patents

Agreement for the mutual safeguarding of secrecy of inventions relating to defense and for which applications for patents have been made. Done at Paris September 21, 1960. Enters into force 30 days after deposit of second instrument of ratification or approval.

Signatures: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom, and United States, September 21, 1960.

Postal Services

Universal postal convention with final protocol, annex, regulations of execution, and provisions regarding air-mail, with final protocol. Done at Ottawa October 3, 1957. Entered into force April 1, 1959. TIAS 4202.

¹ Excluding annex 1 from application of convention.

Ratification deposited: Federal Republic of Germany, August 30, 1960.

Telecommunications

Telegraph regulations (Geneva revision, 1958) annexed to the international telecommunication convention of December 22, 1952 (TIAS 3266), with appendixes and final protocol. Done at Geneva November 29, 1958. Entered into force January 1, 1960. TIAS 4390.
Notification of approval: Poland, August 22, 1960.

Trade and Commerce

Declaration on relations between contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the Government of the Polish People's Republic. Done at Tokyo November 9, 1959.²

Signature (subject to ratification): Ghana, August 19, 1960.

Procès-verbal further extending the validity of the declaration extending the standstill provisions of article XVI:4 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (TIAS 4345). Done at Tokyo November 19, 1959.²

Signatures: Austria and Finland, November 19, 1959; Belgium (subject to ratification), February 24, 1960; Denmark, February 25, 1960; France, March 9, 1960; Norway, March 14, 1960; Luxembourg, April 12, 1960; Japan, April 26, 1960; Netherlands, May 12, 1960; Turkey, July 7, 1960; United States (with a statement), August 2, 1960.

Declaration confirming signature: Belgium, April 5, 1960.

Whaling

International whaling convention and schedule of whaling regulations. Signed at Washington December 2, 1946. Entered into force November 10, 1948. TIAS 1849.

Adherence deposited (with a statement): Norway, September 23, 1960.

BILATERAL

Ceylon

Agricultural commodities agreement under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 455; 7 U.S.C. 1701-1709), with exchange of notes. Signed at Colombo September 30, 1960. Entered into force September 30, 1960.

France

Amendment to agreement of June 19, 1956, as amended (TIAS 3689, 3883, and 4313), for cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy. Signed at Washington September 30, 1960. Enters into force on the day each Government receives from the other written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements.

Israel

Convention for the avoidance of double taxation of income and for the encouragement of international trade and investment. Signed at Washington September 30, 1960. Enters into force upon exchange of instruments of ratification.

Liberia

Agreement relating to investment guaranties authorized by section 413(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 847; 22 U.S.C. 1933). Effected by exchange of notes at Monrovia September 6 and 12, 1960. Entered into force September 12, 1960.

² Not in force.

Luxembourg

Agreement amending the memorandum of understanding of July 7, 1954 (TIAS 3029), relating to the disposal of redistributable and excess property furnished in connection with the mutual defense assistance program. Effected by exchange of notes at Luxembourg March 4 and June 10, 1960. Entered into force June 10, 1960.

Norway

Agreement amending the agreement of February 13, 1960, relating to a weapons production program. Effected by exchange of notes at Oslo April 26 and September 18, 1960.

Pakistan

Agreement supplementing the agricultural commodities agreement of April 11, 1960 (TIAS 4470). Effected by exchange of notes at Karachi September 23, 1960. Entered into force September 23, 1960.

Correction

BULLETIN of October 3, 1960, p. 531, 18th line of text of second statement of September 17: The sentence should read, "This negative policy has been emphasized continually in Soviet action outside the United Nations and in attacks on all aspects of the United Nations program."

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: October 3-9

Press releases may be obtained from the Office of News, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C. Releases issued prior to October 3 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 543 of September 15, 558 and 559 of September 26, 562 of September 27, and 572 of September 30.

No.	Date	Subject
578	10/3	Aviation talks with India.
*579	10/3	Cultural exchange (Republic of the Congo).
580	10/5	Meeting of National Advisory Committee on Inter-American Affairs.
*581	10/4	Thayer: "The Growing Role of Cultural Exchange in International Relations."
582	10/4	Thayer: "Does Higher Education Have Obligations in Relation to Political Objectives Abroad?"
583	10/5	Aide memoire to Venezuela on Dominican sugar purchases.
584	10/6	Union of South Africa credentials (re-write).
*585	10/6	Cultural exchange.
†586	10/8	Merchant: Paderewski "Champion of Liberty" stamp.
587	10/7	Bohlen: El Paso City Council Advisory Committee.
588	10/8	Development Assistance Group communique.
589	10/8	Buzzing of U.S. submarine by Cuba.

* Not printed.

† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

Africa		
Immigration Quotas Established for Fourteen New Nations (text of proclamation)	654	
U.S. Requests Inclusion of Item on Africa in U.N. Agenda (Wadsworth)	657	
American Republics. Inter-American Advisory Committee Holds Sixth Meeting	641	
Aviation. India and U.S. Open Aviation Consultations at New Delhi	644	
Communism. Key Characteristics of the Communist Threat (Bohlen)	635	
Cuba		
Puerto Rico Refutes Charges of U.S. Colonialism by Cuba and U.S.S.R. (Muñoz Marín, Wadsworth)	656	
U.S. Protests Provocative Flight by Cuban Aircraft	640	
Cyprus. Immigration Quotas Established for Fourteen New Nations (text of proclamation)	654	
Dominican Republic. U.S. Position on Dominican Sugar Purchases Explained to Venezuela (texts of U.S. and Venezuelan aide memoire)	640	
Economic Affairs		
Development Assistance Group Concludes Third Meeting (text of communique)	645	
The 1960 United Nations Conference on Tin (Nichols)	661	
U.S. Position on Dominican Sugar Purchases Explained to Venezuela (texts of U.S. and Venezuelan aide memoire)	640	
Educational and Cultural Affairs		
Does Higher Education Have Obligations in Relation to Political Objectives Abroad? (Thayer)	646	
11th Session of the UNESCO General Conference (delegation)	664	
Immigration and Naturalization		
Immigration Quotas Established for Fourteen New Nations (text of proclamation)	654	
Record Number of Visitors' Visas Issued in Fiscal Year 1960	651	
India. India and U.S. Open Aviation Consultations at New Delhi	644	
International Information. Century 21 Exposition (text of Executive order)	644	
International Organizations and Conferences		
Development Assistance Group Concludes Third Meeting (text of communique)	645	
11th Session of the UNESCO General Conference (delegation)	664	
Japan. Crown Prince and Princess of Japan Visit Washington (Eisenhower, Merchant, Prince Akihito)	642	
Nigeria		
Federation of Nigeria Admitted to U.N. Membership (Herter, Wilcox)	659	
President and Secretary Congratulate Nigeria on Independence	643	
Presidential Documents		
Century 21 Exposition	644	
Crown Prince and Princess of Japan Visit Washington	642	
Immigration Quotas Established for Fourteen New Nations	654	
President and Secretary Congratulate Nigeria on Independence	643	
Science. Century 21 Exposition (text of Executive order)	644	
Treaty Information. Current Actions	665	
Union of South Africa. Letters of Credence (Naude)	643	
U.S.S.R.		
Key Characteristics of the Communist Threat (Bohlen)	635	
Puerto Rico Refutes Charges of U.S. Colonialism by Cuba and U.S.S.R. (Muñoz Marín, Wadsworth)	656	
U.S. Commends Secretary-General on Reply to Soviet Attack (Wadsworth)	656	
United Nations		
Federation of Nigeria Admitted to U.N. Membership (Herter, Wilcox)	659	
The 1960 United Nations Conference on Tin (Nichols)	661	
Puerto Rico Refutes Charges of U.S. Colonialism by Cuba and U.S.S.R. (Muñoz Marín, Wadsworth)	656	
U.S. Commends Secretary-General on Reply to Soviet Attack (Wadsworth)	656	
U.S. Requests Inclusion of Item on Africa in U.N. Agenda (Wadsworth)	657	
Venezuela. U.S. Position on Dominican Sugar Purchases Explained to Venezuela (texts of U.S. and Venezuelan aide memoire)	640	
<i>Name Index</i>		
Bohlen, Charles E	635	
Eisenhower, President	642, 643, 644, 654	
Herter, Secretary	643, 659	
Merchant, Livingston T	642	
Muñoz Marín, Luis	656	
Naude, Willem Christian	643	
Nichols, C. W	661	
Prince Akihito	642	
Thayer, Robert H	646	
Wadsworth, James J	656, 657	
Wilcox, Francis O	659	



**the
Department
of
State**

**UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE**
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

**Participation of the United States Government
in
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES**

July 1, 1958-June 30, 1959

This volume is designed to serve as a reference guide to the official participation of the U.S. Government in multilateral international conferences and meetings of international organizations during the period July 1, 1958-June 30, 1959. The United States participated officially in 394 international conferences and meetings during the 12-month period covered.

In addition to a complete list, the volume presents detailed data on many of the conferences, including the composition of the U.S. delegation, principal officers, participation by other countries and organizations, and brief statements of the actions taken.

Publication 7012

Price: \$1

**CALIFORNIA
STATE LIBRARY**

NOV 3 - 1960

DOCUMENTS SECTION-X

Order Form

**To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.**

Enclosed find:

**\$ _____
(cash, check, or money
order payable to
Supt. of Docs.)**

**Please send me.....copies of *Participation of the United States Govern-
ment in International Conferences, July 1, 1958-June 30, 1959.***

Name: _____

Street Address: _____

City, Zone, and State: _____

